

THE
EVOLUTION
OF WAR

by EMANUEL KANTER

THE EVOLUTION OF WAR
A MARXIAN STUDY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T5-CWT-706

THE
EVOLUTION OF WAR
A MARXIAN STUDY

By
EMANUEL KANTER



CHICAGO
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
1927

Copyright 1927
BY CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

Printed in the United States of America



PREFACE

For thousands of years the scholars and prophets of Civilisation have been grappling with the problem of WAR. In Judea, the Hebrew prophets, especially Isaiah, piously declaimed against warfare. But the swords of the Hebrew warriors were not thereby beaten into plough-shares, nor their spears into pruning-hooks. In the Graeco-Roman world the priests and the philosophers, with but few exceptions, sanctioned WAR on religious and philosophic grounds. As early as the year 513 B. C. Heraclitus of Ephesus, the gloomy philosopher, said that war is the father of all things. The Stoic philosophers Zeno and Chrysippus, as Malthus in our time, were of opinion that God scourged humanity with war in order to prevent the overpopulation of the earth. Cicero and Plutarch believed that war was an agency for the preservation and spread of Culture. The latter praised Alexander the Great, the Mace-

donian conqueror, for bestowing the gifts of Civilisation upon the subjugated peoples of the Orient; while the former, the most pernicious sycophant in Rome, declared, "Since Rome has acquired possession of the world by war, it must employ force to keep the universe from collapsing." The Epicureans, on the other hand, were opposed to war. Lucretius, in his philosophic poem *On the Nature of Things*, called upon Venus, the adulterous mistress of Mars, the god of war, to stop its ravages on land and sea. But it continued nevertheless. Neither they, nor Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Seneca, Musonius Rufus and the rest, could, in their day, present one clear idea as to how war was to be driven from the earth.

In the period of Feudalism, so full of tumult and strife as it was, only one scheme for the maintenance of Peace was propounded. The Church Councils, by declaring "The Truce of God", attempted to outlaw war on Holidays and on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday of each week. But this gesture for Peace was unsuccessful in proportion to its preposterousness. The powerful feudal barons could not be restrained by decrees. In the days of the absolute

monarchs various plans for the elimination of war—the earthquakes of humanity, in the words of Shelley—were promulgated. Towards the close of the sixteenth century Sully, the eminent French statesman, inspired Henry IV with a scheme of a Council of Confederated European Christian States. The army of this Confederation was to be maintained in common and used chiefly to keep the peace. This chimerical plan, however, perished with the assassination of the King. The Abbé de Saint-Pierre, author of the idyllic romance *Paul et Virginie*, published in the year 1722 a scheme for a federation of the states of Europe. It called for the establishment of a permanent tribunal of compulsory arbitration for the settlement of differences between nations. But his pre-Wilsonian and utopian idea was ignored by the then autocratic rulers. And soon thereafter it was completely forgotten.

Meanwhile the bourgeoisie had come into power. And war followed upon war. It was the very scourge of humanity. In fact it had become such a plague that the bourgeois scholars were finally compelled to study the phenomenon in order to find a solution, if that were possible.

After burning an enormous amount of midnight oil they issued forth from their studies formed into two antagonistic schools of thought—the school of Mars or War and the school of Eros or Love, that is, Peace.

The school of Mars, of which Herbert Spencer, Ernst Haeckel, Henry James, Ruskin, Roosevelt, Steinmetz, de Gaultier, E. Seyère, and von Moltke are among the chief exponents, finds that man is by nature warlike; that since war is as old as human nature, and according to some even older, it can never be banished from the earth. This school of course is in high favor today, especially with the Imperialists of the most highly civilized countries, for it lends intellectual sanction to their policy of militarism and navalism. One of the main purposes of this work is to expose the brazen ignorance of these apologists of War, who, consciously or unconsciously, are in the service of the Capitalist Class.

In contradistinction to the school of Mars, or War, there is the school of Eros, or Love. The outstanding representatives of this school, which genuflects to Pax, the goddess of Peace, are Havelock Ellis, Novikov, Holsti, and Professor

Perry. These scholars have learned from anthropology that practically all savages and most barbarians were and even now are living in a state of peace. They are familiar with the fact there is no war among the lower animals, that human nature, which developed from the animal nature of the social apes, was not endowed, from its very origin, with the passion for war. Furthermore, they know more or less vaguely that Wars, as Linguet says, originate from a love of private property. But despite this knowledge they failed to draw the logical conclusion that in order to eliminate War private property must be abolished. Instead, Havelock Ellis places his trust in the capitalist League of Nations. Perry invokes the Golden Rule of Christianity. Holsti dodges the issue completely, and Novikov speaks piously of Pacifism.

The Marxian scholars, unlike those of the school of Eros, which despite its liberal outlook is essentially bourgeois, face the question of War in a more courageous manner. Utilizing the two chief instruments for the comprehension of sociologic phenomena, namely, the Dialectic Method of Reasoning and the Materialistic Conception of History, they discover that, contrary

to the school of Mars, war was not always and will not be forever. They find that Savagery was absolutely peaceful and that the germ of war was first sown in patriarchal Barbarism when the seeds of private property, especially in flocks and herds, were scattered over the social soil. Then cattle raids and, in the Western World, tribute raids disturbed the peace of man. These, however, were not wars in the true sense of the term. They were merely the relatively bloodless prolegomena to the true wars of Civilisation. For in Civilisation the private ownership of land and the organization of the State divide society into antagonistic classes and the consequent lust for property on the part of the ruling section of society expresses itself in war and then in revolution.

In opposition to the school of Eros, or Love, composed mainly of pacifists, who are in the same position as the Larisaean pamphleteer (Herodes Atticus) and believe with him that "war is conceded to be the greatest of all evils by as much as peace is the greatest of all blessings, yet *stasis*, or civil war, as far exceeds war in the magnitude of its evil as war exceeds peace," the Marxians look to Revolution as the

Saviour of Humanity. They predict that by means of Revolution the Proletarians will establish their Dictatorship, as the Russian workers have already done, and therewith suppress the bourgeoisie the world over. Then private property will be transformed into common property and socialized industry will produce for use and not for profit. This latter metamorphosis, Marxian science declares, is the essential basis of Peace. Only Communist society can abolish war.

The abject failure of bourgeois scholarship anent the solution of the problem of War has led me to study the question anew in the Marxian spirit. I find that Marxian scholarship successfully unravels the secret of the Evolution of War and scientifically predicts the manner of its elimination.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	15
SAVAGERY AND WAR.....	29
BARBARISM AND WAR.....	44
CIVILISATION AND WAR.....	69
(A) SLAVE CIVILISATIONS AND WAR.....	73
(B) FEUDALISM AND WAR.....	84
(C) CAPITALISM AND WAR.....	95
CONCLUSION	113

INTRODUCTION

Eris and Mars, brother and sister of discord and strife, are the two deities that the civilised mind has ever attempted to comprehend and fathom.

In dualistic fashion it has antithesised Eros or Love to Eris or Discord, and Pax, the goddess of Peace—the Irene of the Greeks—to Mars, the gory god of war. Moreover, it has fashioned from this contrast, or antagonism rather, two schools of thought centered round the gonfalon of Peace or that of War.

The school of Mars would have us believe that War is a law of nature bred in the very bone and marrow of man, as the venerable American philosopher, William James, believes. They insist further that Heraclitus of Ephesus was wise in saying "War is the father of all things." This view not only posits war as a law of human nature but of animal nature as well, of the very Cosmos itself. The followers of E. Seyère,

the author of "The Philosophy of Imperialism," employ such terms as "ant imperialism," "bee imperialism," "tree imperialism," and so on. They, the most bellicose disciples of Mars, affirm that imperialism exists in all human society, that it also exists among the lower animals, and even in the vegetable kingdom . . . that it is an eternal law of nature, that it is as old as organic life, as the foundation of the first cell. Consequently, the struggle against imperialism and its accompanying phenomena in human society—namely constant wars, militarism, navalism and so on—are doomed to failure. The hope of destroying imperialism is a pure Utopia (cf. M. Pavlovitch, *The Foundations of Imperialist Policy*, p. 18). Edward Rod sums up the thought of this so-called philosophic school of imperialism in these words: "Imperialism always was and ever will be."

The disciples of Mars are not, as one may well imagine, men from any one walk of life. Among them are found generals, admirals, philosophers, poets, professors, and so forth. Machiavelli (1469-1527), Jean Bodin (1530-1596), author of *De la République*, and especially Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) of *Leviathan* fame, praise war and

forcast eternal life for it. In the opinion of the latter Savagery, the period in which war is practically non-existent, as I shall prove later, is a "*bellum omnium contra omnes*." Carlyle, Kingsley, Ruskin, and Emerson, respectable authors that they are, panegyryze war and rhapsodize on its theme. Ruskin, in his "Crown of Wild Olive," brutally declares that "all great nations learned their truth of word, and strength of thought, in war; that they were nourished in war, and wasted by peace; taught by war, and deceived by peace; trained by war, and betrayed by peace;—in a word, that they were born in war, and expired in peace." The New England Transcendentalist, Ralph Waldo Emerson, tells us that war existed in the infancy of society; that it educates the senses, calls the will into action, and perfects the physical constitution. Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, and Lester F. Ward speak of war as the cause of human progress. According to von Moltke, the German militarist, "War is one of the elements of order in the world established by God;" which is also the view of Generals J. J. P. Storey and Homer Lea. Renan, who expressed his hate for the masses by calling them CALIBANS, finds that without

war the virile qualities would decay. The late Theodore Roosevelt, the discoverer of the doubtful river of doubt, was of like opinion. He said, "By war alone can we acquire those virile qualities necessary to win in the stern struggle of actual life." Nietzsche attempts to outbraid them all in his eulogy of Mars. For he says: "Ye shall love peace as a means to new wars, and the short peace better than the long." "I do not advise you to work, but to fight." "A good war halloweth every cause," and so on *ad nauseam*. And finally S. R. Steinmetz (*Philosophie des Kriegen*) and Prof. Rossler relate that war is an ordeal instituted by God by means of which nations are evaluated. "It," say the latter, "will remain the *ultima ratio* for the judgment of the peoples."

If the disciples of Mars discover war everywhere, in the cosmos, among plants, among animals, and especially among men, the disciples of Eros, or Love, find that war is only of late development, that it is no part of the animal world nor of savage and barbarian society. M. Lagorgette (*Le Role de la Guerre*, p. 35) says that "animals are almost entirely ignorant of fratricidal struggles." And V. de Lapouge (*Les*

Selections Sociales, p. 209) relates that "we do not find war, nor even individual murder existing among the highly developed monkeys. . . . Murder, and war, which is assassination by wholesale, are human acts and not the atavistic legacies of far distant ancestors." The latter intimates that war is peculiar to man, even in his savage state. But the work of R. Holsti (*The Relation of War to the Origin of the State*), W. J. Perry (*War and Civilisation*, etc.), and Havelock Ellis (*The Philosophy of Conflict*) show conclusively that Savagery and even Barbarism are free from this pestilence.

The disciples of Eros are, despite their knowledge of the evolution of war, far from comprehending the fundamental basis of it. They especially show no understanding of the problem of its elimination from society. Although Perry, for example, realises that Savagery is free from war and private property in the essential means of production, namely the land and rivers on which they, the savages, hunt and fish, he somehow fails to correlate the phenomena of primitive peace and primitive communal property. That is to say, he does not know that communism in property is the foundation of the peace that prevails among savages.

The Marxian school of thought, from the vantage-ground of the Materialistic Conception of History, bases the peacefulness of Savagery on the fact of the common ownership of the means of production. It declares that the society of savages is classless and that the passion for private property is undeveloped in it. How then, asks the Marxist, can War or Revolution exist in such a society? And he answers that neither the one nor the other is to be found in Savagery. In this regard Etymology lends its aid to the Marxist; for the word "savage" is nothing other than "silvaggio," a forester or woodman. It does not imply that he is warlike or prone to warfare, but rather the contrary.

In like case, Holsti finds that even Barbarism is relatively free from war. He discovers that the so-called wars of the pastoral tribes are merely cattle raids, as exemplified by the Masai of Africa. And of them he says, "The Masai were a relatively peaceful people until their god was supposed to have handed down to them all the cattle of the surrounding communities." Besides, he tells us that the tribes of Upper Barbarism, the Homeric Greeks and the Germans, were not as warlike as most authors assert. Yet

Holsti fails to fully appreciate the fact that the private ownership of cattle, which sowed the seeds of war in the Eastern Hemisphere, and laid the basis for the division of society into classes, is the fundamental economic cause of the transformation of the peacefulness of matriarchal society into the incipient warlikeness of patriarchical society. And further: he fails to realise that it was the patriarch who precipitated the Amazonian conflicts, the "wars" of women against men, in the transition from matriarchalism to patriarchalism. These wars, if one may so call them, were usually of short duration, resulting in the subjection of woman. They may be considered, with one or two exceptions, as "wars" that are less bloody and destructive of life than the cattle raids of the patriarchs and heroes of Barbarism.

In surveying Barbarism the Marxists, on the other hand, affirm that the domestication of animals and their monopolisation by the men led, in some cases, to Amazonian conflicts and to the subjection of the female by the male. The pastoral tribes then engaged in cattle raids, which soon resulted in the accumulation of private property by the ablest warriors. The division

of society into the property owners and the propertyless gradually developed; which division Civilisation organized through the mechanism of the State and legalised by means of written codes of law. Then WAR was born. But in Barbarism proper we hear of cattle raids, of expeditions for gold, as that of the Argonauts in search of the Golden Fleece, and of raids for women as practiced by the early Romans, but seldom, if ever, of wars in our understanding of the term.

The passion for private property, that was quickened by the introduction of the private ownership of flocks and herds, received further stimulus from the fact that slavery for the first time became economically possible. The owners of slaves and cattle began to value the land as a private possession. With the ushering in of the individual ownership of land, free from all tribal restrictions and regulations, and the right to buy or sell at one's own discretion, Civilisation was born. And with Civilisation the State strode forth, armed to the teeth, a social Mars, ready and eager to defend the propertied against the propertyless, the rich against the poor. It further set out to fight the battles of the master

class who, in the first phase of Civilisation, were the slave-owners.

Now Mars was in the saddle. No more was known the idyllic life of savagery, the life of innocent peace in the Golden Age of Humanity; no more were practiced the naive virtues of honesty and hospitality. The innocence of nakedness was gone. No more were men and women free as of old. For the seeds of private property sown by the pastoral tribes of Barbarism had flowered into murder, slavery, and war.

Civilisation is, par excellence, the society of War, for in it the passion for private property finds classic expression and development. We have only to turn to any history of society to realise at a glance that Mars is the god of Civilisation. And by the side of Mars we see for the first time in clearest personification Eris, or the goddess of Discord, the symbol of the strife between the propertied and propertyless classes. Engels (*The Family*, p. 216) well says: "Exploitation of one class by another being the basis of Civilisation, its whole development involves a continual contradiction." This contradiction finds its expression in the wars and revolutions

of the three phases of Civilisation—slave, feudal, and capitalist.

The school of Eros, finding Civilisation engaged in constant warfare, falls into despondency at this point. What is to be done? they ask. How can we save Civilisation, and at the same time abolish War? For they, as well as many other misguided souls, believe that Civilisation is eternal, that it is not a category of history like Barbarism or Savagery. So they searched their minds and hearts for a solution of the riddle of this Sphinx. And they discovered many roads to Peace, which promised the end of war and the saving of Civilisation. Bloch, a Warsaw banker, set up a Museum of Peace at Lucerne. And then he wrote a book to prove that war is on its last legs because man will be unable to face the horrors of modern conflicts. Norman Angell, who is a victim of his own illusions, in his popular work, "The Great Illusion," says that war will cease as soon as nations will learn that wars do not pay. This utopian view has been expressed by Emile de Lavaleye (*Pall Mall Gazette*, Aug. 4, 1888) in this wise: "Countries in general, even when victorious, do not profit by their conquests." David Starr Jordan and Novikov speak

of the exhaustion of the warlike spirit. They tell us that the fighting stocks are killed off leaving the field of life to the unwarlike. Havelock Ellis thinks that the League of Nations can give us peace. And finally Bertrand Russell, the eminent English philosopher, says: "Those of us who do not wish to see our whole Civilisation go down in red ruin have a great duty to perform—to guard the door of our minds against patriotism."

The Marxist, however, finds that it is Civilisation based on the private ownership of the means of production and the division of society into classes that is the cause of all wars and revolutions. Therefore he does not whine, like Russell, about saving Civilisation and at the same time destroying Patriotism and Capitalism. He does not talk of a League of Capitalist Nations and of its peaceful intentions. He does not deal with the exhaustion of the warlike spirit or help in the erection of Museums or Palaces of Peace. He does not facetiously assert, as did Fontenelle, that war is hateful because it spoils conversation. What he does do is to analyze Civilisation, and especially Capitalism, its final phase; and finding that private property is the root of all war he

sets out to educate and organize for its destruction.

What, then, does the Marxist postulate? It is this, that capitalist Civilisation must be destroyed by PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION, for the purpose of transforming the private property of the former into the common property of SOCIALIST SOCIETY. It is only on this basis that war can be gradually eliminated, for competition between classes and nations then vanishes. With the change from production for sale and profit to production for use the hours of labor are gradually reduced. Man, now in the possession of sufficient leisure, educates and improves himself. For the first time in the history of the race he steps forth as a human being, free from poverty, disease, ignorance, and WAR. It is then discovered that he is no longer CIVILISED; that Civilisation, the most cruel phase of human development, has vanished from the earth.

Civilisation, the society of maniacs, in the words of Fourier, is now replaced by SOCIALISM, the first phase of COMMUNISM, after having passed through a longer or shorter period of PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP. In actual practice Socialism reduces war and civil

strife almost to zero and, at the same time, develops the harmonics of industry to the point where man can secure the full product of his toil, minus, of course, that part necessary for reserve funds and the expansion of industry. But even under Socialism, as Lenin tells us, complete harmony, complete freedom, will not yet reign, for the State has not yet completely withered away. Only in the final phase of Communism, when society shall have realised the formula, "To each according to his ability and from each according to his needs," will the last trace of the State vanish and with it the last vestige of bourgeois law. Then, not only WAR but strife of any kind will have become a lost art.

Such is the picture that the Marxist paints of the EVOLUTION OF WAR. And if the bourgeois scholars are skeptical and find it unacceptable we can but refer them to their own preposterous ideas thereanent as proof that their judgment on the question of war and the phenomena relating thereto is of no value.

THE EVOLUTION OF WAR

I

SAVAGERY AND WAR

The civilised mind is in at least one respect a very peculiar one. Being developed in the society that has throughout its experience suffered from the shocks of war it has come to believe that bloodshed is a natural and normal phenomenon. The Civilizee sees War not only among savages and barbarians, but also among fishes, insects, birds, and mammals. The whole of Nature to him is, was, and will be a battle-field. The instinct for warfare is inherited from the lower organisms; it is native to humanity, rooted in the very nature of man. So that the thought of peace on earth is a vain fantastic dream of an idle Utopian. "The institution of War," says W. P. Paterson (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Article WAR), "is rooted

in a deep instinct and an inveterate habit of the human race."

If this latter view were correct one would expect to find WAR as a prevalent condition among savages. Yet, strange as it may seem, Savagery is practically free from this horrific scourge. The pristine warlike savage that our pseudo-scientific historians have conjured from the mephitic recesses of their brains has no real existence. W. J. Perry (War and Civilisation, p. 6) tells us that "an examination of the earliest parts of the Stone Age has revealed nothing in the shape of a weapon, but merely implements designed for domestic purposes." All through the later stages of the Stone Age tools for scraping, cutting, and boring, abound and but few weapons are made. (Cf. Perry, The Peaceable Habits of Primitive Communities, Hibbert Journal, Oct. 1917, p. 33). "Even the arrow-heads of the last stages of the Paleolithic Age in Europe are incapable of killing anything much bigger than a rabbit." (L. Siret, Questions de Chronologie et d'Ethnographie Iberiques, 1913, Chap. I). In fact, so certain is Perry of the peacefulness of the Savage that he categorically says (*op. cit.*, p. 6) that "the complete absence of weapons in

the early Stone Age thus constitutes strong evidence that fighting, even personal combat, was unknown at that period, or was so rare and innocuous as to be negligible." Prof. Sollas (*Ancient Hunters and their Modern Representatives*, pp. 137, 193, 205, *passim*, 1924 ed.) likewise finds that there is not a single implement which can be regarded as a weapon in the first three periods of the Stone Age, which he divides into the Strepyn, Chellean, Acheulian, Mousterian, Aurignacian, Solutrian, Magdelinian and Azilian periods. Stone lanceheads, which may have been used for hunting rather than fighting, first appear in the Mousterian period. Moreover, the art of the Aurignacian people, who painted on the walls of their caves the animals they hunted and never any scenes of war, is further evidence of their unfamiliarity with war. From the viewpoint of Stone Age industry it is probable that Mars was never their God, for the savages of that earliest phase of human evolution bent their energies to the invention and improvement of implements for household use. (Cf. Perry, *Works* cited *supra*).

The argument for the peacefulness of the savage world from the viewpoint of weapons and

implements is reinforced by factual data of a more convincing character. "There exist peoples," says Perry, "who, so far as is known, represent the cultural stage of very early times. They lack in their pure state any form of Civilisation. They are hunters. They make no houses, wear no clothes, do not work metals, do not dispose of their dead, but leave them where they die, and live in communities of relatives without social classes *and holding their property in common*. Such peoples are to be found in South India and Ceylon, Siberia, North America, South America, the East Indian Archipelago, Australia, and Africa, as well as in Northern Europe. *These people are, one and all, when untouched by higher cultural influences, entirely peaceful. Wars between communities and combats between individuals do not happen.*" (Perry, *War and Civilisation*, p. 6).

The Bushmen and Negritos of that section of Africa south of the Soudan and the Great Lakes were originally peaceful hunters. But the incursion of the pastoral Bantus, who are not savages but patriarchal barbarians, introduced strife to a very limited extent. For as Stow (*The Native Races of South Africa*, 1905, p. 534) says, "their wars were more cattle forays

on an extensive scale than determined invasions for the purpose of securing territorial aggrandizement." And further: "the warlike renown of any particular tribe seems almost in every case to have been derived from the personal daring and energy of the particular chief ruling over them at the time than from any other causes." The earliest peoples of India, who were similar in physique and culture to the peaceful Veddahs of Ceylon and the hill tribes of Southern Madras, knew little of the arts of war. The Dravidians and more particularly the pastoral Aryans introduced the first elements of war in India. Most of the Indian tribes of North America were peaceful before the WHITES invaded their territory. Those tribes that practiced primitive agriculture and made pottery were sometimes involved in petty "wars," as, for example, the Iroquois of the State of New York. But these latter, it must be remembered, are barbarians and not savages. So far were they removed from the savage state that they were able to form an Indian league or confederation for the purpose of eliminating strife forever among them, to use the words of the Algonquin chief Hiawatha.

To be more specific: the Veddahs of Ceylon,

together with some jungle tribes of South India; the Semangs, the Sakai, the Jakun of the Malay Peninsula; the Punan of Borneo, etc., are absolutely unfamiliar with war. These tribes and most of the others to be cited below hold their property in common and are not divided into social classes. (Cf. Perry, *The Peaceable Habits of Primitive Communities: An Anthropological Study of the Golden Age*, Hibbert Journal, vol. XVI., Oct., 1917). "The Negrito Semang, who, in their wild state, live in a condition of social equality with communal property, are said to be happy-go-lucky cheery little hunters. . . . The Andamanese have no wars. . . . The Sakai of the Malay Peninsula are mainly hunters. They have no war or intertribal fighting. The Kubu of Sumatra, another people allied to the Malays, are quite peaceful by nature, being shy and timid." (Perry, *op.*, cit., p. 35). The Punan of Borneo*

*The Punan, the least advanced people of Borneo, are absolutely peaceful. They do not even practice head-hunting, as do the Kayan, who are considered warlike. The nature of the warlikeness of this and other head-hunting people, who are by no means the most primitive, may be gleaned from the following quotation:

"Most people are aware of the nature of the warfare of the Borneo tribes. It is head-hunting. This is the chief form of warfare among many peoples, in-

have communal property, are not divided into classes, are unfamiliar with pottery and, according to Hose and McDougal (*Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, 1902, vol. II, p. 180 et. seq.), know nothing of war. Ratzel (*History of Mankind*, vol. II, p. 211 et. seq.) speaks of the hunting tribes of Siberia, especially the Chuckchis and the Ostiaks, as peaceful. "Warfare and fighting are unknown among the Eskimo. They have no

cluding those of the Himalayan region, Assam, Upper Burma, South-west China, the East Indian Archipelago, Formosa, New Guinea, and parts of Oceania.... The method of getting heads is similar among many of the head-hunting tribes. Small parties of warriors set out and either ambush people, men and women indiscriminately, or rush a village just before dawn. Little open fighting takes place, for directly a few heads are taken the party at once sets off for home. The Kayan of Borneo go out to seek heads on the occasion of the death of a chief, and sometimes they take revenge at the same time for some injury or insult. But they generally leave an injury unavenged for years, and that until it is necessary to procure heads for ceremonial purposes." (W. J. Perry, *An Ethnological Study of Warfare*, *Memoirs and Proceedings, Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, vol. 61, 1916-1917, pp. 4-5). Also, in his *Growth of Civilisation* (p. 203), Perry says: "The case of the Borneo head-hunters is important in the study of the beginnings of organized violent behavior in different parts of the earth, for several of the head-hunting tribes were demonstrably peaceful food-gatherers a few generations ago. *Their warfare consists entirely of head-hunting expeditions.*"

word for WAR, and they do not scold or swear. The women are on a footing of equality with the men. . . . Social grades are unknown, and property is communal." The Athapsacan Dénè, who live south of the Eskimo, have no chiefs, no religion, and never resort to arms; "in the case of a conflict, opponents lay aside their knives and wrestle with each other, grasping each other's hair." The Salish people are both honest and peaceful. The Eastern Algonquins of Canada and the Chippewas are perfectly peaceful and harmless, as were the Beothuks of Newfoundland. The chief unwarlike peoples of the United States in pre-Columbian times were the Paiute of Nevada, Utah, and Arizona. They knew neither pottery nor primitive agriculture. Prof. Kroeber (*Types of Indian Culture in California*, Univ. of Cal. Pub., *American Arch. and Ethnol.*, vol. II, No. 3, p. 81) says: "From the time of the first settlement of California, its Indians have been described as both more primitive and peaceful than the majority of natives of North America." Thomas, Wheeler, Spencer and Gillen, Holsti and others, speak of the peacefulness of the Australians. "War is unknown in Australia," says Thomas, "although there are judicial

combats" (Natives of Australia, 1906, p. 154). "Wars for conquest are not to be found in Australia," asserts G. C. Wheeler (The Tribe, and Intertribal Relations in Australia, p. 149). And on the testimony of the same author (p. 148) the first blood spilt in a fight ends the contest. Letourneau (La Guerre, p. 50) says that war is useless in Australia, for there is no need to fight for food. Moreover, since private property in the means of production is non-existent among them, and since social classes and chiefs are nowhere in evidence, the absence of war may be inferred on logical grounds. Wheeler (op. cit., p. 153) tells us, in support of this contention, that at no time has one tribe ever taken the field as a whole against another. The Tasmanians, whose wooden weapons were used for hunting and for self-defence, were on the whole peaceful (Ling Roth). Captain Cook found them unwarlike and gentle.

Holsti, in his remarkable study entitled *The Relation of War to the Origin of the State*, cites innumerable example of savage tribes who are peaceful in every respect. He shows that "savages, instead of having really warlike qualities born in them, have on the contrary often had

to stir these up through scorn, through the appeals of kinsmen, through exhortations, through the fear of punishment, through promises of rewards, and through superstitious beliefs. . . . Moreover, primitive man, relying on his superstition, has often avenged injuries in a non-war-like way" (p. 61).

It is not only from the above sources that we learn of the peacefulness of savages, but also from tradition. The Golden Age myths that are peculiar to every civilised people and to many barbarians tell us of a time when war, private property, and slavery were unknown. The Walum Olum of the Lënape Indians speaks of the end of the Golden Age among them due to the introduction of killing by sorcery. The Greek poet Hesiod, in his *Works and Days*, pictures to us the actual course of social evolution. He tells of the Golden Race of Men, who were peaceful and happy and propertyless. These were superseded by a Silver Race, among whom there was a little strife now and then, such as killing by sorcery and blood-vengeance. Then followed the Bronze Race which, according to Scott Elliot (*Prehistoric Man and His Story*, Chap. XXVI), introduced WAR. But a careful survey of the evidence shows that the "wars" of the

Bronze Age were at the most raids for the securing of cattle and tribute (Cf. Morgan, *Houses and House-Life*). These are followed by the peoples of the Heroic Age, the race of heroes, who were not as warlike as is imagined. The Trojan War, for example, as depicted in the *Iliad* of Homer, is one in which personal combats between chiefs are the main feature. There is really no general slaughter, no inhuman carnage. Likewise, the warlike character of the early Germans is exaggerated by Tacitus and Caesar. They, as well as the Vikings, developed their warlike character in late times (Holsti).*

*"Prof. Chadwick, in his work on *The Heroic Age*, is very insistent on the point just made, namely, that the barbarians who threatened Europe throughout the centuries, really owed their stimulus to the very Civilisations that they attacked. He states that the greatly military character of the barbarous Teutons who broke up the Roman Empire, as well as of the Welsh, who harried the Romans in like manner, was due to the influence of the Roman army organization on these peoples. Young nobles took service in the Roman army of the provinces, and learned all about military matters, and were able, on their return home, to apply the lessons they had been taught to effective purpose. This, by the way, is a commonplace in the contact between civilization and barbarism. It is only necessary to mention the case of the Zulus." (Quoted by Prof. Perry, *The Growth of Civilisation*, p. 139.)

With the advent of the Iron Age, which Hesiod hated so passionately, War became the scourge of humanity.

The myths that deal with the Ages of the World, as does the one of Hesiod, show a gradual worsening of life, the slow growth of private property, slavery, and WAR (Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Article *Ages of the World*). These institutions did not exist among savages, and the traditions relating to the ages of the World, of which the Golden Age myth is only a part, are never found in their folk-lore. L. H. Gray, in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, p. 183, says that "outside the great culture nations of Asia, Northern Africa, and Europe...only the Aztecs of ancient Mexico, perhaps under the influence of the still more highly developed Mayas of Yucatan, evolved a doctrine of the Ages of the World."

The traditions of the Golden Age of peace and happiness and of the gradual development through the later ages of war and slavery and private property are supported by the evidence herein cited* and also by the work of

*The Tongans, says A. N. Hocart, have traditions of the times when war was unknown. The ancient

legends of the Fijians, who are reputed to be very warlike, tell of a people unpracticed in the arts of war. The legends of the Kurnai Australians and the Polynesians tell the same tale. And F. Krämer says that in the earliest times peace reigned over Fiji, Samoa, Tonga, and Western Polynesia in general.

These peoples, most of whom are now food-producers, that is they do not live solely as food-gatherers or hunters, may be classed as Barbarians. Although there is now a certain amount of strife among them, as is true of many barbarians, they were peaceful in their savage days. In general, as Perry says, food-gatherers are unfamiliar with war. The following list is culled from Perry's *Growth of Civilisation*, p. 6.

Africa: Negrito, Bushmen.

Asia: Veddas of Ceylon, Pre-Dravidian tribes of Southern India, Semang and Sakai of Malay Peninsula, Andamanese, Kubu of Sumatra, Punan of Borneo, tribe in Aru Islands, Negritoes of the Philippine Islands.

Oceanica: Australians, Tasmanians (now extinct).

America: Eskimo, Déné of the Mackenzie Basin, Beothuk of Newfoundland (extinct), Paiute of Utah, Californian Indians, tribes of Tierra del Fuego.

These peoples, who neither cultivate plants nor domesticate animals, have communal property and know nothing of war. The traditions of the Tongans, the Fijians, the Polynesians, etc., indicate that they were once in the same condition of savage peace, based on communism in property. (Cf. F. Krämer, *Die Samoa-Inseln*, I, 394; Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 493; W. Mariner, *An Account of the Natives of Tonga Islands*, p. 67; P. Smith, *The Tonga-Maori*, p. 32; Perry, *The Children of the Sun*, Chap. XI.)

Perry,* Holsti, Ellis, and others. The absence of any dangerous weapons among savages, and the extant savage tribes that are warless and propertyless, in conjunction with the traditionary evidence, can leave no further room for doubt as to the past condition of peacefulness of the Human Race in its savage stage.**

*"Are we," asks Perry, "thus to look back into a Golden Age of Peace, when violence was practically absent from human relations?" And he answers, "I see no other interpretation of the facts." He further adds, "The stories of a former Golden Age of peace and happiness, of which that in Hesiod's Works and Days is the best example, have a substantial basis in fact." Moreover, he infers that it was private property, "so closely associated with rulers, that played an important part in accentuating this form of behavior," that is to say in developing War. (Cf. Perry, Children of the Sun; The Growth of Civilization; War and Civilization; The Peaceable Habits of Primitive Communities, etc.)

**It was formerly the opinion of bourgeois scholarship that primitive man could not have been peaceful because he practiced Cannibalism on a large scale. Even if this were true, which it is not, as the quotation *infra* will show, the practice of anthropophagy, especially in savagery, does not necessarily imply the killing of a human being, for often dead relatives are eaten. In any case, the killing of a few savages for food or ceremonial purposes can in no wise be considered as warfare.

"Evidence thus goes to show that the worst forms of Cannibalism do not occur among the lowest savages, but among barbaric races (Battas, Negroes,

Maoris, South Americans) with a certain amount of culture...Among the lowest savages the worst forms are never found, and it is doubtful whether Cannibalism exists among some of them. The Australians are cannibals from a variety of motives, never through gluttony; the Cannibalism of the Tasmanians and the Andamanese, asserted by early travelers, is denied by later authorities, though the North and Little Andaman Islanders are accused of it by their fellows; the Bushmen and the Hottentots do not seem to be cannibals...while the dwarfs [pygmies] of Central Africa repudiate the idea with horror, though they eat animal flesh freely; the Negritoes of the Malay Archipelago are doubtful; Semang interment shows no evidence of the head being eaten;...and the authors failed to get evidence of cannibalism among the Semangs...Ainus, Eskimos and Fuegians all seem to have been occasionally cannibals...All that can be said is that cannibalism is an occasional custom rather than a fixed habit among the lowest races." (Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Article Cannibalism; Cf. Perry, *Children of the Sun*, p. 222ff.; E. A. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage and The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, Index, Cannibalism.)

II

BARBARISM AND WAR

In the section entitled SAVAGERY AND WAR I have shown that War was and now is practically non-existent among savages. This conception should be kept continually in mind in this study of the evolution of war, for it is the universally accepted opinion of mankind that society originated in war, and that its earliest phase, namely Savagery, was extremely bellicose. Spencer, for example, was convinced of the "militancy of savage societies." Bagehot asserted that the "early age of man was the true fighting age." Huxley believed that in primitive times the Hobbesian war of each against all was the normal state of existence. Vaccaro, Jähns, and Dr. McDougall all agree that War is the natural condition of the first human groups. Dr. Steinmetz and M. Lagorgette see primitive man as an aggressive and bloodthirsty brute (Cf. R.

Holsti, *The Relation of War to the Origin of the State*, pp. 14-15).

Holsti, who is probably the best authority on primitive warfare, rightly opposes the views of these authors. He falls, however, into a strange error in defining War, and thus seems to justify the conclusions of his opponents—the disciples of Mars. According to him, “War may be defined as a state of hostility between human groups in which use is made of physical force, and not infrequently of superstitious means as well, with or without killing, capture, plunder, or conquest” (op. cit., p. 14). On the basis of this definition War may be said to have existed among the earliest savages.

But Holsti is wiser than his definition indicates, for he definitely proves that savages—a term which in his usage includes most barbarians as well—do not really war, but at the most revenge themselves on their personal enemies. Letourneau (*La Guerre*, p. 32) and Wheeler (op. cit., p. 148 sq.) acquiesce in this view. This blood-vengeance is characteristic of the Wagawaga and Tubetide in New Guinea, of the Maoris, the Nootka, the Fijians, the Eskimo about Behring Strait, and a host of other tribes. Likewise, interference with tribal sexual relation-

ships has led to retaliation and vengeance, as among the Indians in British Columbia and Vancouver, the Omahas, the Melanesians, the Polynesians, the Central Australians, and so on. The invasion of hunting or fishing grounds also leads to retaliation, as is evidenced of the Fuegians, the Chicuitos, the Araucanians, and the Indians of North America. The Ojibway, Sioux, Kickapoo, Kansas, Osage, and Omaha retaliate if their hunting grounds are invaded. But these conflicts cannot be called Wars. For, as Mr. Powell says of the North American Indians, who are mostly Barbarians, "their accumulations were not so great as to be tempting; accordingly battle for plunder, tribute, and conquest was almost unknown."

It is the introduction of private property in the means of production that sowed the seeds of War. Originally the people of the savage world owned and controlled the hunting and fishing grounds in common. And every member of the group could hunt or fish without let or hindrance. Even if the tools, utensils, and weapons were owned privately by him, and that is not always the case,* he could not utilize them in the ex-

*W. H. R. Rivers (Social Organization, Chap. VI.,

On Property), speaking of the island of Ambrim, says: "There was no appearance of the individual ownership of land. It was the custom in this island to indicate the nature of the ownership of an object by means of the possessive pronoun. When there was individual ownership a man would indicate the fact by the use of the personal pronoun, and would speak of 'my bow and arrow' or 'my armlet,' but, with one unimportant exception, he would never speak of 'my land,' and would always say 'our land,'" "Moreover," he continues, "this mode of speech was no empty form. A man might clear a piece of ground entirely by his own labor, and might plant and tend it without help from any one, but any member of his *Vantinbül* [kinship group] could nevertheless help himself to any of its produce without asking leave or informing the cultivator." Another illuminating feature of communal property in this island is that indigenous objects are owned by the *Vantinbül* or other large group, while introduced objects may be owned by individuals. "A good example of the difference," says Rivers (p. 106), "is presented by the weapons of Ambrim, of which there are four: the spear, club, bow and arrow, and sling. The first two are common property, and a man will always say 'our spear' and 'our club,' but, on the other hand, the bow and arrow and the sling are individually owned objects, and people said 'my bow and arrow' and 'my sling.' Associated with this usage was a definite tradition that the people had always had the spear and club, while the sling and bow and arrow had been introduced from a neighboring island." In Fiji there is a certain custom called *kerekere*, whereby persons may take the property of others to such an extent that it has served as an effective bar to the adoption of European methods of trading. A Fijian who sets up as a trader is liable to have his goods appropriated by anyone who comes into his store to such an extent as to make his success impossible." (Vide for more detailed information his "The History of Melanesian Society.")

ploitation of others. The law of Hospitality* and the more or less communal life of primitive peoples, which Lewis H. Morgan found not only among savages and the matriarchal barbarians, but even among the Pueblo Indians of New

*Both the savages and the barbarians practice hospitality. In this they are superior to the Civilizees, who have long since forgotten that delightful art. The Veddahs of Ceylon, Bushmen, Andaman Islanders, New Caledonians, Society Islanders, Papuans of the North Coast of New Guinea, and the Australians are hospitable even toward white foreigners. The Mattole of California will "divide the last shred of dried salmon with any casual comer who has not the least claim upon them, except the claim of that exaggerated and supererogatory hospitality that savages use." Among the Arawks, when a stranger, and particularly a European, enters the house of an Indian, everything is at his command. Among many uncivilized peoples it is customary, says Mr. Smeaton, for a man to offer even his wife...to the stranger for the time he remains his guest. The Bedouins of Nejd have a saying that 'the guest while in the house is its lord.' The Greenlanders and the Aeneze Bedouins are hospitable even to their enemies. Vambery tells us of cases in which the Kara-Kirghiz have preferred being harassed with war by the Chinese to surrendering to them such Chinese fugitives as have sought and received their hospitality. Among the Iroquois, Kalmucks, Kands, Californian Pomo and African Herero hospitality is sanctioned by religion and is considered a duty never to be shirked. (Cf. E. A. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, Vol. I., Chap. XXIV; also Lewis H. Morgan, *Houses and House-Life*, etc.)

Mexico, Mexico, and Central America, are sufficient warrant for the conclusion that peace reigned among them. W. H. R. Rivers says of the Banks Islands, a small group north of the Hebrides, that there were frequent disputes "concerning the portions of the land which were owned individually, while there were never any quarrels concerning the part which had been left for the common use of all."

It is chiefly in the world of Barbarism that booty raids, but not Wars, occur; for it is there, as I have said before, that the germ of private property as a means of exploitation was sown. This is true of the Papuans of New Guinea, and of some of the Melanesian and Fijian tribes. It was common among the natives of New Caledonia, Tonga,* New Zealand, and the Indians of

*The Tongans did not always engage in booty raids. In their savage state they were peaceful.

The Tongan tradition is recorded by Mariner. It tells of a time when wars were unknown. "The *bows and arrows* which before that period [the visit of Captain Cook] had been in use among the people of Tonga were of a weaker kind, and *fitted rather for sport than war—for the purpose of shooting rats, birds, etc.*" The latter learned the art of war from the Fijians, who were originally peaceful themselves. W. Deane, *Fijian Society*, p. 229, says that war was introduced recently in Fiji, particularly when firearms were imported. (Cf. Perry, *Children of the Sun*, Chap. XI.)

Central America. "As to the Indians of North America," says Holsti (p. 21), "there are abundant statements to the effect that as soon as these peoples came into contact with the Whites, obtained horses, weapons, and other implements, and learned the value of furs and other trade goods, thefts, which previously had been a comparatively rare trait among them, gradually increased and took the shape of private expeditions for plunder, nay even, as among the Iroquois, to enforce the payment of tribute." Bandelier has shown (Cf. Morgan, *Houses and House-Life*; also R. H. Lowie, *Primitive Society*, p. 218) that even the ancient Mexicans, who, according to Spinden, Mason, and others of the modern school of Anthropology, are supposed to be civilized, but in reality are merely "a confederation of independent tribes which had indeed subjugated other populations, but never to a condition of vassalage," exact tribute.

These expeditions for tribute are not to be classified as Wars, for the simple reason that a true war can only be waged by a society founded on private property in the means of production and classes, in which the State exists as both the instrument and organizer of War. But since Morgan and Bandelier have shown that private

property in land was unknown among them—not even a chief, not even Montezuma himself, was a proprietor or landowner, but merely had the right to the usufruct of a definite section of land temporarily set aside for him and his household by his tribesmen—and since no State and no standing army existed, and no classes based on the possession or non-possession of property, “Wars” were at most, as their history relates, tribute expeditions. It is only in the highest stage of Barbarism, as in the Heroic Ages of the Aryan peoples, that these booty and tribute raids for cattle, women, and precious metals are intensified to the point where true war may be said to exist. But even here, as exemplified by the Trojan War, the conflict is chiefly one of single combat between the opposing warriors (e. g. Achilles and Hector, Patroclus and Hector, etc.). At the very verge of Civilization we do not find anything like the permanent conquest of the territory of one people by another and the enslavement of its inhabitants.

Private property in land, the chief means of production, existed nowhere in the savage and the barbarian world. The domestication of animals and their monopolization by the males in

the Middle Period of Barbarism introduced the first element of private property in the means of production in the Eastern Hemisphere. The mythology of Greece links the taming of women, as for example the daughters of Proetus, with the domestication of animals. These women, tamed by Melampus and his band of armed young men, are really Amazons. They, the worshippers of the quondam goddess of fertility Artemis, represent the spirit of the dying matriarchate in conflict with the rising patriarchate. They are the primitive-communist women-warriors who resisted the usurpation of the communally-owned flocks and herds by the males. They were vanquished, probably with little loss of life. Yet the first sign of private property, it should be noted, was conducive to strife between the sexes. And this, by the way, is the sociologic origin of the "war of the sexes," which mars the domestic life of Capitalist Civilization, as it did that of the Feudal and Slave Civilizations.

In the Upper Period of Barbarism the flocks and herds multiplied and the women were further subordinated. But the land as yet was not private property. Nowhere in Greek literature do we find it stated that land is owned privately.

The authorities, it is true, differ on this point. Dr. Leaf (*Companion to the Iliad*, 1892, pp. 176, 336), Letourneau (*Property*, pp. 240-244), and Prof. Ridgeway (*The Early Age of Greece*, vol. I, p. 678) are convinced that communal land tenure and the open field system are clearly indicated; while Poehlmann (*Feldgemeinschaft bei Homer: In Aus Altertum und Gegenwart*, p. 105ff.) and A. G. Keller (*Homeric Society, Index*) believe that private property in land did then exist. It is probable that the land system in Greece at this time was quite similar to that found by Bandelier in ancient Mexico, where no true private property in land existed, that is to say, land could not be bought or sold, nor was it vested in the chiefs. In Greece, as in Mexico, land was set apart for religious purposes, and for the so-called King, who was really a chief. A scene in the *Iliad* (XVIII, 550-560; 561-572; cf. XI, 67-69), where the "king" is seen among the workers bearing the symbol of his office, and where women are at the same time preparing a feast for the laborers, reminds one of the communal crop-gatherings in Peru. A reading of the *Laws of Manco Capac* will completely banish from one's mind the idea that the Inca of Peru is a king and a land-owner. The parallel be-

tween the Greek and the Peruvian scenes is too striking to be ignored. In any case the mere fact that doubt exists as to whether land was private or communal property is sufficient to show that the private ownership of land was not an established fact in the Period of Upper Barbarism. This fact alone is fundamental in explaining why no true wars but only cattle, booty, and tribute raids characterized that period of social evolution.

The peoples that Morgan classifies as in the Middle Period of Barbarism, the Toltecs, the Aztecs, the Mayas, the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, were by no means warlike. Holsti (*op. cit.*, p. 73) says, "the early Toltecs were not warlike." "Brinton likewise ascribes peaceable qualities to the Mayas...The Conquistadores, says Mr. Davis, found the Pueblo Indians numerous and powerful, living peaceful and happy lives in their villages." But the tribute raids that the Aztecs in particular indulged in sowed the seeds of war. So that one may infer that had not the Spaniards destroyed these Indian societies, private property in the means of production, the State, the division of society into warring classes, and War would have evolved independently. But since European Civilization, founded on private

property, put a period to the evolution of these societies one must look elsewhere for data as to the evolution of War.

It is to the pastoral tribes of Europe, Asia, and Africa that one must turn for a clear view of war, especially in relation to its fundamental cause, private property. The peoples of America had, with the exception of the dog, the turkey, and the llama, no domesticated animals. This lack of flocks and herds slowed up their evolution and ultimately led to their destruction. But in Europe, and Asia, and Africa tribes somehow domesticated animals.*

* "Archaeology has shown," says S. Reinach (*Cults, Myths, and Religions*, pp. 81-82), "that the oldest human habitations, the caverns of the quaternary period, contain so far no trace of domesticated animals...The exploration of the lake dwellings of Switzerland and France, huts built on piles at a little distance from the water-edge, has demonstrated that domestic animals were known in the polished flint age, which, after a long period of transition, succeeded the quaternary era." But in the late Stone Age, however, they were rare; they played a minor rôle in the economy of the tribe.

"Imagine a nation," the author continues, "of primitive hunters living in old France, a country whose indigenous animals included bulls, horses, goats, bears, and wolves...The hunters are divided into clans or little tribes, every one of which claims a different animal as its ancestor. The wolf-clan believes itself descended from a wolf, and to have made a treaty of

These tribes soon shed their matriarchal skin. The men expropriated the women, who, in some cases, expressed their opposition in Amazon revolts. The monopolization of the flocks and herds by the patriarchs intensified the booty and tribute raids a hundred-fold; for among these tribes the passion for private property was now

alliance with all wolves; it cannot therefore, except in case of legitimate self-defense, kill a wolf. The horse-clan thinks itself descended from a horse, and cannot kill one without committing a horrible crime ... Each clan, as a matter of course, abstains from hunting and killing its patron animal. But that is not enough. Since the animals are the protectors of the clan, guide it in its wanderings, and give notice of impending danger, either by cries or by signs of uneasiness, two or more of the species must always be kept with the clan by way of sentinels. These couples grow accustomed to man, and are soon perfectly tame; while the young, born and bred in the very midst of the clan, become its friends. It must be clearly understood that all this will take place only when the animal chosen as totem possesses the attributes for domestication. Thus the bear may be tamed, but is not a domestic animal; ... a few species of wolves or jackals, first tamed and then domesticated, have given man his best friend, the dog; still, the wolf-species, as a rule, is quite intractable, and has remained the constant foe of humanity. On the other hand, the horse, the bull, the wild boar, and the goat... have almost everywhere passed from independence to domestication." (For the various theories as to the domestication of animals vide Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Articles, Domestication, Animals.)

developing. This passion was quickened by the fact that cattle could be stolen and property accumulated thereby. The ablest warriors became in this way the private owners of large flocks and herds of cattle, sheep, and horses. The famous cattle raids of the Greek heroes speak volumes for the contention that even at this late period—the Upper Barbarism of Morgan—no real war but cattle raiding was the chief occupation of the chiefs and the warriors. Odysseus, for example, one of the most successful cattle thieves among the Greek heroes, far superior to Hercules in that respect, possessed, according to A. G. Keller (*Homeric Society*, p. 98), “as much as any other twenty men; twelve herds of kine, twelve flocks of sheep, twelve droves of swine, twenty-three flocks of goats, and, in addition, other 960 swine.”*

Among many other causes of “war” Holsti especially cites the one that is instigated by cattle raids. “Another cause,” he says, “which in com-

*The raids of the heroes into Libya, where they fought the Amazons and many other tribes, can be explained by the fact that, on the testimony of Homer, the finest sheep were found there (*Odyssey*, IV., 85-89, Teubner text). Polyphemus, who suffered from the raid of Ulysses and his companions, had splendid sheep (*Ibidem*, IX., 221-222).

paratively modern times has called forth warlike activity in Eastern Africa is raiding for the purpose of capturing cattle. From this we have reason to conclude that previous to the domestication of animals and the change this brought about in the occupation of the natives, the conditions must have been less warlike. Hence, the universal prevalence of cattle raids in Eastern Africa at the present time ought hardly to be counted among the facts brought forward—e. g., by Steinmetz—to prove the extremely warlike nature of early ages and savage conditions in general” (op. cit., pp. 96-97).

Nieboer, in speaking of the pastoral peoples of the Eastern Hemisphere, adduces innumerable tribes whose “wars” are only cattle raids. The Larbars, the Kovak Kirghiz, the Beni Amer, the Tschuktschi, the Somal, the Gallas, the Ama Xosa, Ovaherero, Mairs and Meenas are cases in point (Slavery as an Industrial System, pp. 284-286). “Among the Ama Xosa and Ovaherero,” he says, “the chief object of warfare is cattle stealing.” Levchine, speaking of the Kazak Kirghiz, relates that “their feuds are caused by the unrestrained desire for plunder.” The so-called wars of the Somal are marauding expedi-

tions. The warlike Masai are merely cattle thieves.*

*It is well to remember that the myth of the parthenogenetic birth of both males and females from males has its genesis in the patriarchal pastoral tribes. For example, the birth of Pallas Athene from the head of Zeus, and the second birth of Bacchus from the thigh of the Thunderer, have parallels among the Masai. The birth of Bacchus, first from the womb of his mother Semele and then from the thigh of Zeus, indicates the existence of the practice known as the *couvade*, which, let it be said, is the most peculiar phenomenon of the transition from matriarchalism to patriarchalism. The following examples will give one an adequate idea of the *Couvade*: "On the birth of a child, the ancient Indian etiquette requires the father to take to his hammock, where he remains some days as if he were sick, and receives the congratulations and condolence of his friends. An instance of this custom came under my own observation, where the man in robust health and excellent condition, without a single bodily ailment, was lying in his hammock in the most provoking manner, and carefully and respectfully attended by the women, while the mother of the new-born babe was cooking, none apparently regarding her." (Quoted from Brett, in the Madras Government Museum Bulletin, Vol. IV., No. I, p. 114.) "The following account is given by Du Tertre of the Carib *couvade* in the West Indies. When a child is born, the mother goes presently to her work, but the father begins to complain, and takes to his hammock, and there he is visited as though he were sick, and undergoes a course of dieting, which would cure of the gout the most replete of Frenchmen." (E. B. Tylor, *Researches Into the Early History of Mankind*, p. 294.) "Of the *couvade* among the fierce equestrian tribe of the Abipones...the Jesuit missionary Dobrizhoffer

'The pastoral tribes of the world then are not really engaged in warfare in the strict sense of the word. At the most they fight in an attempt to steal cattle from one another, and these fights are of very short duration. It cannot, however, be denied that they sow the seeds of war, which

gives a full account: 'No sooner do you hear that the wife has born a child, than you will see the Abipone husband lying in bed, huddled up with mats and skins lest some rude breath of air should touch him, fasting, kept in private, and for a number of days abstaining religiously from certain viands; you would swear it was he who had had the child...I had read about this in old times, and laughed at it, never thinking I could believe such madness, and I used to suspect that this barbarian custom was related more in jest than in earnest; but at last I saw it with my own eyes in use among the Abipones." (Tylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 296-297). "Even before the child is born," says Im Thurn (*Indians of Guinea*, p. 217), "the father abstains for a time from certain kinds of food. The woman works as usual up to a few hours before the birth of a child. At last she retires alone, or accompanied by some other woman, to the forest, where she ties up her hammock; and then the child is born. Then in a few hours...the woman, who, like all women living in a very unartificial condition, suffers but little, gets up and resumes her ordinary work... In any case, no sooner is the child born than the father takes to his hammock, and abstaining from every sort of work, from meat and all other food, except weak gruel of cassava meal, from smoking, from washing himself, *and, above all, from touching weapons of any sort*, is nursed and cared for by all the women of the place."

Can peoples with such practices really be warlike?

are developed into actual warfare by peoples on a higher cultural plane. Besides, the pastoral tribes also introduce the germ of Slavery. Most hunters and fishers do not keep slaves, says Nieboer. Even the majority of cattle-owning tribes are free from them. The "warlike" Kazak Kirghiz, the Turkomans, the Masai, and the pastoral nomads of South Africa have no slaves. "Among true pastoral tribes slavery, as a system of labor, is of little moment." (Nieboer, *op. cit.*, p. 267). Moreover, Heitland has shown (*Agricola: A Study of Agriculture and Rustic Life in the Graeco-Roman World from the Viewpoint of Labor*) that Slavery was very mild in the early Greek and Roman world. It was practically limited to domestic servitude. There were of course a few slave herdsmen and agriculturists. But, according to A. G. Keller (*op. cit.*, p. 191), "slaves in Greece and among the Greeks were mostly women and children; . . . that no uprising of slaves is chronicled during the Trojan War and the long absence of the chieftains, witnesses the fact that male slaves were few and faithful." The work of Schmoler, Ingram, Flügel, Schurtz, Lippert, Dimitroff, Peschel, Wagner, and Nieboer confirm Lewis H. Mor-

gan's contention that slavery was practically unknown in Lower Barbarism; that it was rare in Middle Barbarism, and that it existed as an incipient institution in Upper Barbarism, in which period the captive was made a slave instead of being killed directly or sacrificed to the gods, as among the Aztecs of Mexico (Ancient Society, Index, Slavery).*

Savages and Barbarians are essentially peaceful. The Fans, one of the most warlike nations

*In attempting to reverse the unfounded opinion of the Civilizees as to the warlikeness of Savagery, I found that the savages are extremely hospitable, rarely practice head-hunting or cannibalism, seldom, if ever, steal or tell lies. In a word, they are far from being the brutes they are imagined to be. Moreover, they hardly ever practice human sacrifice.

"Human sacrifice," says Westermarck, "cannot be regarded as a characteristic of savage races. On the contrary, it is found more frequently among barbarians and semi-civilized peoples than among genuine savages, and at the lowest stage of culture known to us it is hardly heard of." It was known in Ancient India, Greece and Italy, among the Celts, Teutons and Slavs, the Semites and Egyptians, the early Japanese, many African tribes, South Sea Islanders, some American tribes, and particularly the Mayas and Aztecs. The Aztecs themselves did not adopt the practice until the fourteenth century, two hundred years before the conquest. They did not practice it in their matriarchal period. (Vide Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, Vol. I., Chap. XIX.; *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Article, Human Sacrifice.)

of Western Africa, rarely meet others in battle, and when they do, if one or more persons are injured, the War is over. This is also true of the warlike Ilongotes of Luzon. Of the Hawaiians, Ellis tells us that if their chief was killed his people immediately ran away. Abel and Guise observe this of some tribes of New Guinea. The Maori and Melanesians* suffer few casualties

*W. H. R. Rivers shows that in Melanesia there is a close connection between communal ownership [especially of land] and mother-right, on the one hand, and individual ownership and father-right on the other. He also asserts that there is a definite association between communal ownership and sexual communism. "In several parts of Melanesia there is definite evidence for the association of communal ownership with customs which point to the existence in the past of organized sexual communism, which is still present here and there in Melanesia. In Eddystone Island, which presents one of the most definite examples of communal ownership, the practice of monogamy exists...but it may be noted that the very strict limitation of sexual relations only occurs after marriage, and that before marriage there is a sort of organized communism which may be the survival of an earlier state in which this communism also existed after marriage." (Rivers, *Social Organization*, Chap. VI.; Cf. his "The Melanesian Society," 2 vols.)

When sexual communism and the communal ownership of land was in actual existence in Melanesia, war was unknown there. But when patriarchalism gradually destroyed these institutions in a number of these tribes, the germ of conflict was introduced among them.

when they fight. Of the former Mr. Taylor says that "the battle was chiefly a trial of skill and strength between the principal chiefs, and the fall of one of them was often the signal of the flight of his people," and even in the case of a general fight the slaughter was inconsiderable (Gudgeon, *The Whence of the Maori*, *Journal Polynesian Society*, vol. XII., p. 174). The aborigines of Cape York cease fighting as soon as one man falls. As to the juridical fighting among the Australians, Mr. Mathews writes that no mortal blow is ever given. The Naga tribes aim in their battles more at blows than actual killing (Hodson, *The Naga Tribes*, p. 113 sq.). Among the Oakinacken Indians the death of a chief means the end of the war. Of the Columbian Indians, Franchire relates that the fall of one or two men ends the fight, as is also true of the Chinooks. Among the California Indians the first blood spilt terminated the fight (Bancroft). The fighting of the Apaches had "more the character of assassination and murder than warfare." When the Blackfeet had killed one adversary their military ambition was satisfied (McClintock). Dorsey remarks that fighting for several days in succession is not an Omaha custom. In this tribe permission was required to organize or

to join a war-party. When, as is also true of the Pouca, Padousa, and Osages, one single adversary was killed, the war-party returned home. The warlike Abipones, says Dobrizhoffer, curse a victory at the expense of one of their countrymen's life. In Africa, the Wataturu cease fighting when a few men are slain. During two years of warfare, observes Speke, between the great chief of Nunda and a petty chief only six men were killed. Even the warlike Masai spill little blood and slay few in their "wars" (Thomson, *Through Masai-Land*, p. 126 sq.).

The Maori, the Samoans, the peoples of New Guinea, Savage Islands, Polynesia, Australia, the Ba-Huana of Africa, most Indians of North America, and the Abipones do more shouting than fighting. So little truth is there in the view that the primitive peoples are warlike that Deniker (quoted by Holsti) concludes that primitive warfare consists more of shouting and terrifying than of serious fighting, and that, consequently, few are slain. Moreover, the existence of exogamy is a vital factor in the prevention of war in the primitive world. "This system," says Bancroft (*The Native Tribes of the Pacific States*, vol. I., p. 132), "operates strongly against war between tribes; as in war it is caste against

caste, and not tribe against tribe. As the father is never of the same caste [or gens] as the son, there can never be inter-tribal warfare without ranging fathers and sons against each other." And Mr. Frazer says thereanent (*Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. III., p. 356 sq.), "In war it was not tribe against tribe, but division against division, and as the children were never of the same caste as the father, the children would be against the father and the father against the children, part of one tribe against part of another, and part against itself, so that there would have been a pretty general confusion." Wherever exogamy exists, and it is prevalent in the primitive world, war is practically impossible.*

*Just as the exogamic practices make for peace in the primitive tribes, so the secret societies that have assumed economic and administrative functions create strife. When these societies, as in Australia, occupy themselves with non-economic and non-political practices such as Initiation Rites and Ceremonies, and as among the matriarchal Iroquois with religious and ceremonial functions, then they do not cause a disturbance of the tribal peace. But, so soon as these societies engage in economic and political activities, the tendency is to dissolve the clan-system, to subordinate woman, and to oppress them along with the uninitiated tribesmen, i. e., those who do not belong to a secret society on account of poverty. The secret society, in dissolving the clan, breaks down maternal

law and substitutes paternal law and the right of private property. This causes a certain amount of strife among primitive peoples.

In Western Africa the secret societies "punish criminals, act as the native police, protect private property, etc." (H. Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, p. 104). The Secret Societies of the Melanesian and African peoples became the source of wholesale oppression and almost unmitigated evil, and result "in prostituting the goods of the community to the private ends of a small number of initiates" (Webster, *Op. cit.*, p. 61). The Dukduk society of the Bismarck Archipelago oppresses the weaker members of the community, especially the women and the uninitiated poor, by means of forced contributions. For example, if a woman sees a Dukduk mask she is fined. If she intrudes upon the sacred lodge of the society she is penalized to the extent of 30 to 50 dewarra. "At Buka, one of the Solomon Islands, when the women see the spirit Korkorra, they throw away everything they may be carrying and rush for a safe retreat. Then the men who have been following in their wake, pick up the articles and take them to Talohu, or lodge." The religion of spirits, here as elsewhere, is used for purposes of exploitation. Among the Banks Islanders the Tamate Society confers special privileges on its members. "A member of this society, by marking with his badge the fruit trees or gardens which he wishes reserved for any particular use, may be sure that his taboo will be respected... Other prerogatives of members in Melanesian societies include the right to land in certain portions of the beach, which the uninitiated were prevented from doing save by the payment of a fine—the right of way along certain parts—and, above all, a share in the fines in food and money from their less-privileged fellow-countrymen or visitors." These secret societies are the forerunners of a propertied aristocracy which subsequently organizes a State. The Marxian scholar will find it to his advantage to inves-

The evidence in this section clearly indicates that the Barbarians are little inclined to war. In the words of Holsti (op. cit., pp. 108-109), the warlike aspirations of these peoples—the Maori, Fijians, Tongans, Dyaks, Galla, Masai, Kaffirs, North American Indians in general and the Iroquois in particular, as also the early Germans and the Vikings—are of late growth.

tigate the Secret Society—the pre-State. Its relation to the origin of the State proper has not yet been analyzed by anyone. (Cf. Hutton Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*; *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Article *Secret Societies*; C. S. Burne, *Handbook of Folklore*; Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, Index; R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, Chap. V., *On Secret Societies and Mysteries*; W. H. R. Rivers, *Social Organization*, chapter on *Fraternities and Secret Societies*, etc.)

III

CIVILISATION AND WAR

The history of Civilisation is the history of War and violent Revolution par excellence. It is in this phase of social evolution that Mars and Eris reign supreme. They are seldom disturbed by the intrusion of Peace, which may be defined as the interval between two wars.

Why, it may be asked, is Civilisation, whether it be in its slave, feudal, or capitalist phase, so warlike? Why have the civilized peoples of the earth fought in the past, and why do they fight now? A review of the causes of the peacefulness of savage and barbarian society will supply the background for the answering of these questions.

It was proved previously that the savage was and is even now peaceful; that he seldom, if ever, blew the trump of war. The fundamental cause of his sylvanically serene existence was found to lie in the fact that savage society knew nothing of private property in the means of production. The land on which the savages hunted

and the rivers in which they fished were common property. Accumulation of wealth being impossible, no vital differences in property could be developed among them. Consequently their Society was not divided into economic classes. Men and women were free and equal in every respect. The State, "the organ of class domination, the organ of oppression of one class by another, 'was as yet unborn. The standing army and the police, "the chief instruments of force of the State authority," had no place in their world. The enslavement of woman by man and of man by man was no part of their social life. Pax, the goddess of Peace, was on the savage throne.

Barbarism, although relatively peaceful, sowed the seeds of private property in the means of production, and consequently those of war. In the Middle Period of this phase of social evolution man monopolized the flocks and herds of the tribe and subjected woman thereby. This expropriation of the female sex precipitated Amazonian uprisings which the men easily suppressed, generally with little loss of life. The patriarchal pastoral tribes now engaged in constant raids in order to augment their stock of domesticated animals. Many fights ensued,

which, however, were of short duration and involved few casualties; so that they can hardly be called Wars. Later, the element of slavery was introduced: the captured women and children were now utilized, the former as domestic slaves, the latter as herdsmen. This factor was an additional incentive to the barbarian to engage in raids, and it intensified their character. But as the men, even in the Upper Period of Barbarism, were seldom enslaved, for as yet there was no private property in land—the economic basis of male slavery—the raids never developed into sanguinary wars.

In Civilisation, however, the germs of war sown by Barbarism are fully matured. All the elements necessary for the prosecution of war are now in existence. The State appears for the first time in history, with a standing army at its beck and call. Private property in land establishes an economic basis for the extensive employment of slaves, so that now the prisoners of war are spared for the benefit of the slave-owners. Wars are constantly fought for the acquisition of land, tribute, and slaves. As property accumulates Society is divided into classes. These classes—patricians, plebeians and slaves—are ever in conflict with one another. The institu-

tion of war is augmented by that of Revolution. Not only is there a struggle between city-state and city-state, slave empire and slave empire, and later between feudal lord and feudal lord, capitalist nation and capitalist nation, but also between freeman and slave, feudal baron and serf, capitalist and proletarian.

The passion for private property, the dominant passion of Civilisation according to Morgan, now finds its classic expression in War and Revolution. The State, the organizer of war and the suppressor of revolution, is Civilisation's chief instrument in the service of Mars and Eris. The latter ride rough-shod over humanity. Man bleeds from every pore: and Civilisation stands helpless before the gory deities it has fashioned. It cannot drive them from the blood-soaked earth. The slave Civilisations of the past have vanished, feudal Civilisation has perished, yet war and revolution plague us more than ever. Capitalist Civilisation in particular is being sacrificed on the altars of Mars and Eris. It cannot banish these deities from the earth, because it would preserve the institution of private property, the fundamental cause of all wars and revolutions.

War and Civilisation are Siamese twins. The society of competition and private property can

never hope to free itself from the scourge of war and revolution on the basis of the retention of private property in the means of production. Only when Capitalism, the last phase of Civilisation, and therefore Civilisation itself, is destroyed, can one hope to dethrone Mars and Eris. Peace can reign only when private property is no more. It is the function of the Proletarians of the world, through the mechanism of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, to transform private into communal property and, in consequence thereof, War and Revolution into Peace.

A

SLAVE CIVILISATIONS AND WAR

The economy of the various Civilisations of antiquity was based fundamentally on the private ownership of land and slaves. The absence of any kind of machinery and the employment of crude farming implements for the tilling of the soil necessitated the exploitation of large bodies of slaves, especially on the larger estates. These slaves were seldom the poor citizens of the city-state or slave empire in question. The Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Persians, the Athenians, the Spartans, the

Macedonians, and the Romans were averse to the enslavement of their own people. They, therefore, had to acquire slaves by means of War.

The State, invented by Civilisation, organized armies for this pernicious yet necessary economic purpose. The free farmers and proletarians of the ancient slave civilisations were drafted for war. They were sent out by the slave-owners on expeditions of conquest and plunder. The conquered peoples were compelled to pay tribute to the victors, while the captives were enslaved.

The great warrior-Pharaohs of Egypt, Thothmes III. (1500-1450 B. C.), Amenhotep III. (1411-1375 B. C.), and Rameses II. (1292-1225 B. C.) spread destruction far and wide. Slaves and tribute poured in from Cyprus, Babylon, Palestine, and the land of the Hittites. The country had become rich and powerful, yet war and revolution eventually destroyed it. In 525 B. C. it fell under the sway of the Persian king Cambyses. Babylonia next rose to power through war and strife. Sargon I. (c. 2800 B. C.) spread its influence as far as the Mediterranean Sea. King Hammurabi (1958-1916 B. C.) gave it a code of laws. One of these laws reads as follows: "If a man seize a male or female slave,

a fugitive, in the field, and bring that slave back to his owner, the owner shall pay him two shekels of silver." But Law could not save the Civilisation of chattel slavery. In the year 735 B. C. Tiglath-Pileser IV. of Assyria, after conquering Syria and Palestine, led his armies against Babylonia and ended its existence by incorporating it into his Empire. The wars of the Assyrians—"the Romans of the East"—were frequent and frightful. Sargon (722-705 B. C.), Sennacherib (705-681 B. C.), Esarhaddon (681-668 B. C.), and Ashurbanipal (668-626 B. C.) were constantly fighting the revolting Babylonians, Samaritans, Hittites, Judaians and Egyptians. On the walls of the palace of Sargon is written: "With the help of the sun-god who aided me to vanquish my enemies, I besieged, I occupied the town of Samaria, and I brought into captivity 27,280 persons." But this empire of war and slavery was destroyed by the combined forces of the Medes and the subjected Babylonians in the year 606 B. C. Then Persia rose to power, as a consequence of the successful revolt of Cyrus against the Medes (553 B. C.). Cyrus conquered Lydia (546 B. C.), Babylon (539 B. C.), as well as Syria and Palestine. Cambyses (529-522 B. C.) added Egypt to the Empire. Then

follow the innumerable battles between Persia and Greece, in which Athens and her allies are victorious. Finally Alexander the Great defeated Darius at the battle of Arbela (331 B. C.) and the Persian Empire perished. In the meantime Sparta and Athens had exhausted themselves in constant internecine strife; and in the year 338 B. C. Philip of Macedon vanquished them. Rome then conquered Greece and Macedonia. By the year 146 B. C. they were Roman provinces.

"The policy of conquest of Biblical Judea and of the states of antiquity," says M. Pavlovitch (*The Foundations of Imperialist Policy*, p. 21ff.), "of Sparta, of Athens, and finally Rome, was already dictated by economic causes, by the class interests of the dominating social groups. . . The wars of the Athenian republic with the Persian monarchy were wars for Asia Minor and Black Sea colonies, for trade hegemony, for supremacy over the seas bounding the southern and eastern parts of the Balkan peninsula—that is, over the Ionic, the Aegean and Black seas. . . The whole policy of conquest of the Athenian and other Greek republics was carried on exclusively in the interests of a definite class, a class of free Greek citizens—or, in other words, of slave-owners. This policy of conquest pursued definite

economic aims: firstly, the consolidation of the trading hegemony of Ancient Greece in Asia Minor, the southern part of present day Russia, and in all the waters reaching the shores of territories where Greek influence penetrated; secondly, the multiplication of the number of slaves—that is, of the class of men without rights mercilessly exploited by the free citizens of Athens. Thus the Grecian policy of conquest was a continuation of its internal class policy.

“The role of the class interests in the foreign policy of the states of antiquity in relation to the Roman Empire is described with marvelous salience and talent by the famous Italian writer, Ferrero, in his classic six-volume work, *The Greatness and Decline of Rome*. He reveals with wonderful talent and mastery the economic causes of the second and third Punic Wars right up to the destruction of Carthage, the campaign in Macedonia, Greece, and Gaul. He shows that all this policy of conquest, both in its origin and fundamental features, was a phenomenon of an economic order, and he describes how the bankers, farmers, merchants, usurers, financiers—all this class of exploiters put into motion the victorious force of the legions of Rome. . . In all the conquered territories the best land, the best es-

tates, the richest mines, and so on, were expropriated, and presented to generals as rewards, or given on lease to senators, financiers and so forth."

The consequence of all these wars, for land, for slaves, for trade monopoly, etc., was that the free farmer and the free but propertyless proletarian fell into poverty. The land was monopolized by the aristocratic land owners and usurers. The farmer migrated to the city, where he became a political tool in the hands of the wealthy landed proprietors and slave-owners. Since labor was in disrepute* in Athens, in

*In the Homeric Age and in the time of Solon labor was not held in contempt. "But in the fifth century," says P. N. Ure (*The Origin of Tyranny*, pp. 16-20), "this has changed. Contrast the tone of Solon with that of Xenophon, who states that some citizens actually live by handicrafts, and that mechanical occupations are rightly held in contempt by civilized communities. When Socrates has demonstrated to Alcibiades that the Athenian ecclesia is made up of workmen (cobblers, criers, tent-makers and the like), he proceeds to this inference: 'if you have a contempt for them individually, then you must have a contempt for them as a body.' This contempt for manual work appears in Aristophanes, as for instance in his constant contemptuous references to Euripides' mother, who had been a green-grocer. It is recognized and discussed by Herodotus, who regards it as of com-

Sparta, in Rome, and elsewhere, he would not work.* In no case would he compete with the slave. So that he had to depend on the bribes of the rich and the generosity of the State for subsistence. This condition, particularly in Rome, welded the classes together, in so far as foreign conquest and the suppression of slave rebellions were concerned. For from war the

paratively recent growth: as he puts it, 'most of the Greeks have learned to despise Artisans.'"

Plato condemns manual labor as unworthy of a free man. (*Republic*, VII. 522b, IX. 590c; *Laws*, V. 741e; *Gorg.* 517d-518a; *Alcib.* I. 131b). When Plato is building up his ideal state wage-earning is left to those citizens who are mentally deficient. (*Rep.* II. 371e). Aristotle says: "Citizens ought not to live the life of an artisan or tradesman" (*Pol.* IV. 1328b; *Comp. Rhet.* I. 9, 27). Also: "The city where the artisans are numerous and the men-at-arms are few cannot attain to greatness. (*Pol.* IV. 1326a.)

*"The growth of contempt for labor has been explained by Drumann as due in part at least to the Persian wars and the resulting plunder, which must have made a good many citizens financially independent. The payment of the huge panels of jury-men, which did so much to release the poorer citizens from the necessity to work, was an ultimate outcome of the Persian wars. The Peloponnesian war may have completed the process. It lasted through nearly thirty campaigns (431-404 B. C.) and must have disorganized the labor market. Slaves must in all directions have supplanted the free men who were wanted for military service." This tendency is to be noted in the whole of antiquity. (*Ure*, *op. cit.* pp. 19-20.)

free proletarians and the landless farmers received employment as soldiers, and in the interim of peace the tribute collected from the vanquished was the source of their food and pleasures. The plebeians, likewise, could hope to augment their failing resources in land and slaves and money by war and by the more thorough exploitation of their captive slaves. These classes, usually led by the patricians, drowned the slave rebellions in blood. For, as I have said heretofore, the patrician, the plebeian, and the ancient proletarian, were in unison on the question of slavery.

The slaves in the eyes of the freemen were creatures of a lower order. They were beasts, to whom no mercy should be shown. Even the best minds of Greece, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and Plutarch among the rest, in agreement with the worst minds of their day, held that a slave had no soul and that he must meekly submit to his lot of hard labor and brutal treatment. Cicero, one of the vilest of men, as Prof. E. S. Beesly, a friend of Karl Marx, has shown, denounced Verres, the propraetor of Sicily, because "he had not caused a slave to be crucified for a very minor offense." Even the Gracchi...

made no stand against the prevailing barbarity towards captives sold into slavery. They only attempted to democratize institutions for their free clients. (H. H. Hyndman, *The Evolution of Revolution*, p. 79).*

C. Osborne Ward portrays in his *Ancient Lowly* the revolts of the slaves of antiquity against their property-loving civilised masters. During the Peloponnesian war, which devastated and depopulated Greece, the slaves in the silver

*Aristotle, of whom the bourgeois scholars are so proud, said that "the lower sort of mankind are by nature slaves, and it is better for them, as for all inferiors, that they should be under the rule of a master." In his *Politics* (1256) he says, "War is strictly a means of acquisition, to be employed against wild animals and inferior races of men, who, though intended by nature to be in subjection to us, are unwilling to submit: for war of such a kind is just by nature." The admirable Nicias owned 1,000 slaves, who were worked to death in the silver mines. The filthy super-moralist Cato, another favorite of the respectable Professors of Capitalism, says (*De Agric.* II. 7), "Sell the old oxen, the worn-out sheep and other animals, fleeces, hides, carts, implements, *any old or diseased slave, or any other waste that remains over.*" So speak most of the so-called wise men of antiquity. (Cf. A. E. Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth*; Cairnes's *Slave Power*; Hyndman, *Chapters on Greek and Roman Slavery*; Ure, *The Origin of Tyranny*, pp. 45-47).

mines of Laurium* (near Athens) fled to the enemy, the Spartans, who had established themselves at Decelea in Bœotia.** This defection of the exploited slave miners weakened Athens considerably, and contributed to her ultimate defeat. The Romans, the conquerors and masters of the then civilized world, were especially subject to slave rebellions, for they were geniuses in the art of oppression. In the mines and on the large estates — *latifundia* — slave revolts broke out. Drimarchus, the Chian, led a slave insurrection in the island of Chios. Viriathus and his slave followers rebelled in Spain. Eunus, Achoeus, Cleon, and Athenion led the slaves of Sicily against their Roman oppressors. And, lastly, Spartacus, the Thracian gladiator, led the slaves of Italy in one of the most spectacular revolu-

"Athenaeus (VI. 272e) speaks of tens of thousands of slaves as working in the Laurium mines and losing their lives at the time of the second slave war in Sicily (103-99 B. C.). Of the 20,000 who deserted to Decelea, when it was occupied by the Spartans in 413 B. C., it is not unlikely that large numbers were miners from Laurium. This mine supplied the money for the building of the Athenian navy." The coined blood of the slave-miners was the basis of their sea power. (Ure, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-46.)

**"When Decelea was occupied," says Zimmern, "the Athenians lost their crops...Before this they were able to enjoy their harvests." (p. 423, note 1.)

tions of slave against freeman that the ancient world had ever known. (Cf. Hyndman, Chap. IX; for slave revolts in Greece see Diodorus, XXXIV, 2, 19; Athenaeus, VI, 272; Thucydides, VII, 27, VIII, 40; for tribute revolts in Rome see G. Ferrero, *A Short History of Rome*, pp. 76-78, 159, 201, 217, etc.)

Unfortunately these insurrections were drowned in the blood of the slaves. Those that were captured were either crucified or re-enslaved under harsher conditions. The failure of these revolts may be ascribed to the fact that in no case could the slaves, even where temporarily successful, as at Chios, establish themselves on a non-slave economic basis. The economy of the ancient world had not yet reached the point of development where the system of slavery could be superseded by a higher economic form. Yet these slave revolts were useful as symptoms of the underlying defectiveness of a hopelessly diseased society, that was later supplanted by Feudalism—the second phase of Civilization.

It is evident from the foregoing data that the constant wars of antiquity and the innumerable revolutions that accompany them were all centered round the conquest of land, the securing and exploitation of slaves, and the levying of

tribute. Slaves were necessary for the tilling of the soil monopolized by the aristocratic land-owners, and for the working of the mines, and in petty industry. In the wars necessary for the acquisition of these slaves the ancient empires destroyed one another. The slave revolts hastened their fall. The various classes in which society was divided, the freeman and the slave, the patrician, the plebeian, and the proletarian were engulfed in the social cataclysm. War and Revolution had completed their initial task. Mars and Eris sat on their gory thrones, the king and queen of dead empires. They had completely destroyed the slave city-states and the slave-empires. The first phase of Civilisation had vanished from the earth. Yet there was no Peace..

B

FEUDALISM AND WAR

The decaying Roman slave-empire was continually subjected to the incursions of the Germanic barbarians. As early as the latter part of the second century B. C. the Cimbri and the Teutons invaded southern Gaul and northern Italy. In the reign of Augustus the legions of Rome were practically annihilated in the Teuto-

berg Forest (9 A. D.); which defeat forever precluded the Romanization of the German provinces and the enslavement of their inhabitants.*

After this eventuality the military situation on the Rhine-Danube frontier was for a long time in *status quo*, although the Marcomannic Wars in the latter half of the second century A. D. inclined the scales more and more against the Romans. The first invasion which presaged the ultimate demise of the Roman Empire occurred in the year 376. The Goths, pressed by the Mongolian Huns, crossed the borders of the empire and settled in Moesia by agreement with the then Emperor. But soon the Romans began to oppress these famished barbarians by selling them food at exorbitant prices. The consequence

*Arminius, the leader of the Cherusci, fought against Varus because he attempted to impose upon them the Roman laws, which would have meant slavery for the freedom-loving barbarians. In this connection it is significant to note that on the capture by the barbarians of one of the Roman lawyers in the escort of Varus, they cut out his tongue, saying to him, "Hiss now, you viper." The hatred for lawyers was also peculiar to the revolutionary feudal peasantry, especially those under Wat Tyler, who hanged every lawyer they could apprehend. The more or less communal customs and practices of the barbarians and the feudal peasants account for their rage against those who write down the death-warrant to their vestigial communistic rights and privileges.

of this was a revolt in the year 378. At the battle of Adrianople the Romans were defeated and Valens, their emperor, was slain. Then the Visigoths under Alaric captured Rome (410 A. D.) and plundered it, as is the fashion with barbarians who are on the verge of Civilisation. The Vandals and the Huns continued the devastation of the Roman lands. And finally, Odoacer, a German general in Italy, assumed the title of king, thereby putting an end to the Western Empire (476 A. D.). From the fall of the Western Roman Empire to the ninth century the so-called barbarian kingdoms were established: in Gaul the "kingdoms" of the Franks and the Burgundians, in Great Britain the "kingdoms" of the Jutes, the Angles and the Saxons, in Spain the "kingdom" of the Visigoths, in Africa that of the Vandals, in Italy that of the Ostrogoths and, later, that of the Lombards. The constant strife within and without these "kingdoms" gravitated round the amalgamation of the dying slave-economy of the Roman world, represented by the Roman law, and the vanishing gentilism of the barbarians, embodied in German communal law. The result of this social process was the semi-communistic and the semi-slave society known as FEUDALISM. To an analysis of this

second phase of Civilisation, in so far as it relates to war and revolution, my attention must now be directed.

Paul Lafargue, the eminent French Marxist, has shown in his valuable work, *THE EVOLUTION OF PROPERTY* (Chap. IV), how Feudalism gradually evolved out of the village Collectivities and from conquest. "The feudal barons," he says, "whether village chiefs transmogrified by the natural march of events, or military chieftains installed by the conquerors, were bound to reside in the country which it was their duty to administer and defend. The territory they possessed and the dues they received, in the shape of labor and tithes, were the recompense of services rendered by them to the cultivators placed under their jurisdiction. The barons and their men-at-arms formed a permanent army, nourished and maintained by the inhabitants whom they directly protected." The serfs (the *servi*), the former slaves of the Roman landed proprietors, and the villeins, originally the poor freemen who had become coloni, or farmers, in the service of the land owners, worked not more than three days for their feudal lord and the rest of the time for themselves on their land, of which they could not be deprived. Moreover, since

there was no absolute property in land in feudal times, the serfs "had a share in the baron's harvest and a right of pasture in the forest and arable lands."

The serfs and the villeins (tenants) were not warriors. They were content to pay their feudal dues in services and in kind for the military protection that the lord gave. The latter, a doughty warrior, and his vassals or brave men, were organized for purposes of defense and for war. "These barons," says Lafargue (*op. cit.*, p. 94), "in order to enlarge their territories and extend their power, carried on continual warfare among themselves, only interrupted now and again by a short truce necessitated by the tillage of the fields. The wars of the barons may be compared to the industrial and commercial competition of modern times. The outcome is the same; both alike culminate in the concentration of property, and the social supremacy which it bestows. The vanquished, when not killed outright or utterly despoiled, became the vassals of the conqueror, who seized upon a portion of their lands and vassals. The petty barons disappeared for the benefit of the great ones, who became potent feudatories, and established ducal

courts at which the lords in vassalage were bound to attend." The towns, which were in constant danger from the attacks of bandit barons and knights, had to place themselves under the protection of the king or of powerful feudal lords. In the heyday of Feudalism these towns were in the hands of a sort of municipal "aristocracy," who shared the communal lands surrounding the towns among themselves. The handicraftsmen organized guilds, open to all the artificers of the locality, in order to "resist the despotism of the aristocrats of the towns, who monopolised the lands and the power." Later the guild-masters, because of their rising prosperity, formed closed corporations. They then united with the municipal aristocrats in order to cope with the now discontented apprentices and journeymen. This alignment of the classes in the towns resulted in class war. "All the industrial towns of the Middle Ages," says Lafargue, "were stained with blood by the conflicts between journeymen and craftsmasters." (Op. cit., p. 138.)

In the country the petty barons gradually disappeared as a result of the constant wars that were carried on. So that in time the feudal lords were no longer necessary for the protection of

the serf and for the maintenance of order. The strife between castle and castle slackened; the lord was now free to go to the king's court and play the courtier. Then it was that Feudalism as a system of reciprocal duties and services perished.

In the period of Feudalism proper, when war was of everyday occurrence (for then it was that the "big" baron was swallowing up the "little" baron), the Church attempted to intercede in the name of Jesus, "The Prince of Peace," by proclaiming "The Truce of God." The Church Councils decreed that all warfare was to stop during Lent and various other holidays as well as on Thursdays, Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays. But this intervention on the part of the Church had as little effect in controlling the "dogs of war" as the Capitalist League of Nations has today.*

*Of course the Church was not seriously interested in eliminating war from feudal and post-feudal society. Following the lead of St. Augustine it declared that there were two kinds of war—the just and the unjust. In the days of the Roman Empire the unjust wars were represented by the contemporary barbarian onslaughts on the Empire, the just by the efforts of the Empire to defend itself and the cause of Civilization. In later days the Lutheran and Anglican schools of thought were emphatic in branding Rebellion as

one of the most criminal types of unjust war. The Anglican Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion says: Rebellion had its prototype in the apostacy of Lucifer; monarchy is of divine right, being a copy of the divine rule; rebels will be punished with eternal damnation; history abundantly proves that it is as foolish and futile as it is wicked... This is ample proof that the Church was opposed only to the wars that were damaging to its economic interests. (Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Article War.)

It is also erroneously believed that the Church was the chief agent in the destruction of ancient slavery. "Not one of the Fathers," says Westermarck, "even hints that slavery is unlawful or improper. In the early days martyrs possessed slaves and so did abbots, bishops, popes, monasteries, and churches; Jews and pagans only were prohibited from acquiring Christian slaves. So little was the abolition of slavery thought of that a Council at Orleans, in the middle of the sixth century, expressly decreed the perpetuity of servitude among the descendants of slaves... As late as the nineteenth century the right of enslaving captives was defended by Bishop Bouvier." The Council of Gangra, about the year 324, pronounced its anathema on anyone who should teach a slave to despise his master on pretense of religion. Throughout Christendom the purchase and sale of men, as property transferred from vendor to buyer, was recognized as a legal transaction of the same validity with the sale of other merchandise, land or cattle. During the latter part of the Middle Ages the Church favored the liberation of the slaves of laymen, in order to secure the property of these slaves on their death. But she took good care to prevent the liberation of her own slaves. The Council of Agatho, in 506, considered it unfair to enfranchise the slaves of monasteries. These slaves were the last to be manumitted. In the seventh century a Council at Toledo threatened with damnation any bishop who should liberate a slave belonging to the

The "big" barons destroyed the "little" barons and expropriated them. Out of these blood-drenched lands they formed vast baronies, the lords of which often rivaled the king in riches and power. And now it was that the wealthy and ambitious lords began to encroach upon the rights of their serfs. They monopolised the forest-lands, the common property of the village. They forbade the peasants to hunt; they prevented them from gathering wood for the repair of houses, fences, and implements. No longer could the serfs fish in the streams of the communal domains. They were completely deprived of their communistic feudal rights, and at the same time the feudal burdens were aggravated. Revolts broke out everywhere. In Northern and Central France we have the Jacqueries or peasant insurrections, which were drowned in the blood of the feudal revolutionaries (circa 1358). The quasi-feudal revolts of the Englishmen under Jack Straw, Jack Cade, and Wat

Church without due compensation from his own property. And in the middle of the same century a Council decreed that the children of incontinent priests should become the slaves of the Churches where their fathers officiated. She was also the last to free her serfs. (Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, Chap. XXVII.)

Tyler, which were most treacherously suppressed, are significant as symptoms of the rise of a new economy. Shakespeare, who on other occasions called the people of his day "hempen-homespuns," "the barren sort," "mechanic slaves," "the mutable, rank-scented many," "garlic-eaters," "multiplying spawn," and "worthless peasants," sneers at the famous rebellion of Wat Tyler (*Vide his Henry IV.*). In his eyes it was a "damned commotion, led on by bloody youth." In Germany the Saxon peasants fought against the Emperor Henry II., and the Suabian peasants revolted against the usurping lords in the time of Luther (1525). (Cf. E. Belfort Bax, *The Peasant War in Germany*; Hyndman, *op. cit.*, Chaps. 18, 19, 20; V. F. Calverton, *The Newer Spirit in Literature*, p. 29).

Although War was ubiquitous in feudal times, Revolution seldom occurred; and that only when the lord no longer respected the customary communistic rights of the serf. For despite the manifest oppression and exploitation the serfs were content to work part of the time for themselves and part for their feudal lord. The surplus value appropriated was utilized for the maintenance of the lord and his boon com-

panions, among whom were beautiful mistresses and adventurous bards. The serf, however, having the economic privilege of working on his own piece of land, the usufruct of which was inviolate, and of securing the necessary accessories of his economy in the communal forests and pasture lands, did not protest, for he was able to live in relative comfort. It cannot be said that the serf ever felt the pangs of hunger, that the "wolf" was ever at his cottage door. But so soon as the lord was enabled to throw off the feudal duties due his serfs and tenants, and to expropriate their communal lands, Revolution broke out everywhere. The Church, particularly that of Luther, no longer sought to win the feudalists to peace. The "Truce of God" had fallen into desuetude. The ecclesiastics openly supported the usurping feudal lords and sanctioned their illegal claims to the peasants' property. During the Peasants' War Luther and Melancthon, of whom the bourgeois scholars are so fond, urged the extermination of these "devils," as they called the peasants. And they were exterminated—for the greater glory of bourgeois Protestantism.*

*The sycophantic behavior of Luther—the supersti-

War, it is seen, was the law of the feudal world. The manifest struggle was between feudal lord and feudal lord, but the latent one was between the lord and his serf. Only when the "big" barons had swallowed up the "little" barons and had accumulated enough land and moveable property for the development of a higher economy did the covert struggle break out into open conflict. The Civil Wars of the serfs and peasants against their usurping feudal masters incarnadine the twilight of Feudalism. In a word, the gory feudal sun rose in war and set in revolution.

C

CAPITALISM AND WAR

The wars and revolutions of the first two phases of Civilisation—slave and feudal—were in comparison with the cattle raids and tribute expeditions of the later periods of Barbarism ex-

tious ignoramus who believed in the devil and who went so far in his theologic idiocy as to throw an inkwell at his imaginary head—during this revolt earned for him the title Dr. Lügner (Dr. Liar). According to the latter, the worst tyranny ought to be submissively and patiently endured, inasmuch as every nation richly deserves chastisement, and on the other hand tyrants will be adequately punished in the future state of retribution.

ceedingly destructive and bloody. They were so in proportion to the development of private property in the means of production with its concomitant exploitation of class by class.

In the savage world the passion for private property was not yet developed; for then the means of production were owned and used in common. At the most there was merely individual or personal property in hunting and fishing implements and in weapons of the chase. These were employed by the savages and early barbarians on the communal hunting and fishing grounds for the appropriation of the necessities of life from nature. The fruits of the earth so acquired were utilised to satisfy the needs of the community. In no case were they sold for the profit of the individual; so that private property was not accumulated and, consequently, the tribes were free from class division. In such a propertyless and classless society war was unknown. But with the domestication of animals and their monopolisation by the males in the Middle Period of Barbarism, the germ of private property was sown in the social soil. Individual property, now fortified by private property in the essential means of production, laid the foundation for the division of society into classes.

The peacefulness of savagery was now superseded by occasional Amazonian conflicts and by frequent cattle and tribute raids. But no true war as yet existed; patriarchal barbarism merely sowed the dragon's teeth of strife.* But in Civilisation, as the story goes, these teeth grew into armed men, and ever since we have had

*It is to be understood that if the economy of the Barbarians is disturbed, as was that of the Germans, by the pressure of the Huns; or if by peaceful economic evolution barbarians reach the verge of Civilisation, they will be compelled to war. But this fact in no wise weakens my argument for the relative peacefulness of barbaric society. For even savages, who under normal conditions of existence never go to war, will fight when faced with the loss of their hunting lands by the encroachment of the whites. In studying the evolution of society one must consider the inherent nature and character of each phase, as Marx and Morgan do, and not over-emphasise disturbing factors. Vulgar anthropology, like vulgar political economy, "loves" to study these disturbances, and thereby confuses and perverts the social sciences. Classical anthropology, like classical political economy, focusses its attention on the essentials of each social epoch and, despite the disturbing factors, which it neither overemphasises nor minimises, but explains, scientifically organizes the data presented. It is the only school of anthropology that has shed light on the subject of primitive man. But, apart from the valueless criticism of the psychological school of Kroeber or that of the "sterile" school of Boas and Goldenweiser, the Marxians realize that it is just as necessary to pass beyond classical anthropology as it has been beyond classical political economy.

WAR. The modes of production of slave and feudal Civilisation were very primitive, therefore they could not develop the instruments of war to any degree of perfection; so that we find warfare, in comparison with that of bourgeois society, only slightly developed and relatively unimportant.

However, with the introduction of gunpowder and the other highly-mechanized instruments of war, Civilisation takes on a new aspect. Its wars are now most bloody and destructive in character.* The savage and the barbarian, wherever encountered, are mercilessly exterminated. The feudal knight and the baron's men-at-arms are mere anachronisms on the field of battle. The

*The casualty list of savage, barbarian, slave and feudal societies together is much less than that of the World War of 1914-1918.

The casualty figures, compiled by the League of Nations, are as follows:

9,998,711 known dead,
2,991,800 presumed dead,
6,295,512 seriously wounded,
41,002,039 otherwise wounded.

According to W. T. Kittredge, Assistant Director of the League of Red Cross Societies, war, disaster, and famine took a toll of 62,000,000 lives since 1914, a period of twelve years. Also 140,000,000 people were injured in that time.

These figures are set down for the benefit of the numberless champions of Capitalist Civilisation.

feudal peasants are slaughtered by the hosts of the absolute monarchs, who are everywhere in the saddle. They in turn are unseated by the rising Bourgeoisie, who, having accumulated **Money** the classic form of wealth, are in need of political power, in order to develop further the germs of the newly-founded Capitalist economy. The various bourgeois revolutions accomplished this necessary task. In England in the year 1688 Cromwell destroyed the absolute monarchy of Charles I.; and from the blood-soaked earth of Merrie England there grew, slowly and painfully, Capitalist Democracy. This democracy, supposedly a government of, by, and for the people, to use the words of Abraham Lincoln, is really the political form which masks the Dictatorship of the Bourgeoisie over the Proletariat. In France the Revolution of 1789 unseated the absolute monarch Louis XVI. and established a Republic. The Napoleonic Wars (1801-1815) cleared the ground for the development of Nations by destroying the last vestiges of feudalism and absolutism. Meanwhile the INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION, which began in England in the year 1750, had spread its effects throughout Europe. Its inventions, its machinery, its improvements in the means of production, finally estab-

lished the necessary technical basis for a true Capitalist economy. The bourgeoisie are now engaged in revolutionary activity, especially in those countries where absolute monarchs had succeeded in regaining their thrones after the Napoleonic débâcle. These revolutions are of the very essence of Nationalism. The rise of Nations, a tale of war and revolution, is the history of Europe until the year 1871, when Germany was finally unified. "Karl Marx regarded the war of 1870-1871 as one of the last great national wars in Europe." M. Pavlovitch (*op. cit.*, p. 29) says: "The first stage in the capitalist development of Europe was symbolised by national wars, having as their aim and result the formation of big national states—huge state forms, the framework of which would be wide and roomy enough for the further development of the productive forces, for the further growth of capitalism."

The economy of capitalist society in the period of national, as distinguished from imperialist, wars, namely from 1848-1871, was fundamentally one of the production of goods, of commodities to be sold chiefly in the home market. Then the textile industry was the centre of gravity of the national economy. But, as Pavlovitch says,

"from the moment of the transference of the centre of gravity of capitalist economy from the textile industry to the metallurgical does the imperialist epoch begin, and Chamberlain, 'the man from Birmingham,'* comes into the forefront of the historical arena as the first representative of the new epoch—an epoch of colonial fever. England, whose statesmen like Disraeli, used to say only recently, 'The colonies are millstones round our neck,' begins to grab unoccupied territory on all sides with such industry that for the period of 1884-1900 it had taken possession of territory measuring no less than 4,000,000 sq. kilometers." (Vide also G. Zinoviev, *Der Krieg und die Krise des Sozialismus*).

This grabbing of colonies is economically necessary, for now the capitalists are more concerned with the exportation of capital than of commodities. In order to export capital, usually in the form of means of production, it is of utmost importance to have political and military control of colonies. "It was between 1860 and 1880," says Lenin (*Imperialism: The Final*

*The seat of the metal industry of England, as contrasted with Manchester, the home of the cotton industry.

Stage of Capitalism, p. 63), "and, significantly enough, in the last twenty years of the nineteenth century also, that England entered her greatest period of colonial conquests, while France and Germany secured most of their colonial possessions between 1880 and 1900." This period introduces the monopoly stage of capitalism, as a consequence of the shift from the textile to the metallurgical industry as the focus or centre of gravity of production. Prior thereto, concretely from 1860 to 1870, Capitalism was in its pre-monopolistic stage, dominated by the ideology of free competition. In England the bourgeoisie had commenced this era of free competition in 1840, and it flourished there until 1860. Their politicians at the time opposed any sort of colonial policy and Mr. Disraeli, as quoted above, considered the colonies a millstone round the neck of his country. Statesmen were even considering with favor the policy of freedom for the few colonies they controlled. But so soon as finance capital, that is capital that directs industry, entered upon the economic scene, so soon as it was necessary to export capital, so soon as free competition was replaced by capitalist monopoly, a wild scramble for colonies and for

spheres of influence began. The capitalist monopolists divided up the world between them. They subjected the lower races. Savages and barbarians were ruthlessly expropriated of their lands. They were enslaved or forced to work for a mere pittance. They were taught the civilised art of hard work, which, by the way, is alien to savage and barbarian society.* If the Bible tells us that the patriarchal Jehovah, or the Works and Days of Hesiod that the patriarchal Zeus invented hard labor, they are not wrong. Civilisation is the society of Work as it is that of Money and War.

Colonial conquest and expansion is the policy of every developing capitalist nation in its monopoly stage. From the years 1884 to 1900 "England secured 3.7 million square miles of land with a population of 57 million souls; France 3.6 million square miles with a population of 36 millions; Belgium, 900,000 square miles with a population of 30 millions, et cetera."

*Bourgeois scholarship fails to realize that primitive societies were free from hard labor, from sexual modesty, from dishonesty, crime, and from War. Only when the patriarch introduced the germ of private property did these vices, that Civilisation has developed to the Nth degree, come into being.

(Lenin, *Imperialism*, pp. 63-64). Cecil Rhodes, one of the first statesmen to be called "Imperialist,"* said in the year 1895: "I was yesterday in the East End of London and witnessed

*This word first came into use at the end of the nineteenth century, when English Imperialism was running amok. The Greeks and the Romans had no word for Imperialism. Neither were the feudalists nor the capitalists in the non-monopolistic phase of their evolution imperialists, for "Imperialism is the monopolist stage of Capitalism." Lafargue shows (*The Evolution of Property*, pp. 8-9) that neither capitalist property nor the word Capital existed in Greece and Rome. The word Capitalist, he says, was first introduced in the French Dictionary of Sebastian Mercier in the year 1802. "Capitaliste: this word is well-nigh unknown out of Paris. It designates a monster of wealth, a man who has a heart of iron, and no affections save metallic ones..." The word Imperialism, as the word Capitalism, cannot be applied to slave and feudal societies. Nevertheless, bourgeois scholars, like W. S. Ferguson and Tenny Frank, write books on Greek and Roman Imperialism respectively. They agree with Ferrero in the belief that "Imperialism exists at all stages of human development." But these scholars of the Historical School of Imperialism are less worthy of condemnation than the pygmy-minded founder of the Philosophical School of Imperialism—E. Seyère. His idiotic philosophy leads him to conclude that "Imperialism is a phenomenon which penetrates all forms of life [amoebas, fishes, and jackasses even], and all social elements." In his eyes trees and plants are imperialists. This preposterous idea of his finds its parallel in Petrucci's idea of Property. "Property," he says, "is a fact of nature...It is instinctive and exists among plants and

a meeting of the unemployed. After listening to all the wild talk and cries for bread, I went home, and reflected upon what I had seen and heard, and came to the conclusion that Imperialism was more imperative than ever.... Here is my solution for the social problem: if we are to save the 40 million inhabitants of the United Kingdom from a murderous Civil War, we, the colonialists, must secure new territories to be occupied by the growing population, where we can find new markets for the goods manufactured in our mills and factories. It is all a question of food supply. If you do not want a civil war you must become imperialistic." But already at the dawn of the twentieth century the

animals as well as man...Plants do not occupy the soil; they possess it." (In *Formative Influence of Legal Development*, compiled by A. Kocourek and J. H. Wigmore, Chap. X.).

The various "Marxian" theories of Imperialism, apart from the correct one of Lenin, are:

(1) Kautsky's: Imperialism is the policy of industrial capital.

(2) Hilferding's: Imperialism is the policy of finance capital.

(3) Kautsky's theory (revised): Imperialism is the policy of finance capital in contradistinction to industrial capital which pursues a peace-loving policy.

(Vide M. Pavlovitch, *The Foundations of Imperialist Policy*, for a detailed analysis from the Marxian viewpoint of these partially correct theories.).

division of the world was practically completed, so that Capitalism was compelled to organize international monopolies in order to save itself from immediate ruin. The world was again parceled out to the various groups of financiers and industrialists. These monopolists halted the further development of the productive forces and caused the prices of commodities to increase. "Capitalism," says Lenin, "in its imperialistic form, organizes a general socialized form of production, and actually drags Capitalists, willy-nilly, consciously or unconsciously, into a new form of social production, takes them out of a world of free competition to put them into a world of absolute socialization. Production becomes communistic, but property remains a private affair." This socialization of production, based on the internationalization of capital, did not, as some bourgeois and pseudo-Marxian writers believe, work for Peace. On the contrary, Capitalist imperialistic monopoly favored the policy of War. It transformed, as we well know, the national wars of the pre-monopolistic stage of capitalism into the imperialist wars of its monopolistic stage. The late war of 1914-1918 is the best example illustrative of this idea.

For now, the world being already partitioned, the slightest attempt of one nation to seize a piece of land even in far off Africa, might precipitate a World War. Of course, it is to be remembered that since we have reached the stage where capital is the chief export, the focus of conflict was centered round the securing of those lands that contained the natural resources requisite to the exportation of capital. What the Capitalists desired above all were iron, coal, and oil lands. Iron, the very essential of the metallurgical industry, is now of superior importance, for on this metal depends the rise or fall of nations. We see the truth of this statement in clearest outline in the fact that prior to the World War Germany was both the premier metallurgical and military nation of Europe; and only when the weight of the American metallurgical industry was added to that of the Allies did the scales of war incline in favor of the latter. This industry, in the stage of Imperialism, takes precedence over the coal industry; but the latter is still of importance, although Oil is threatening to supersede coal as an industrial commodity. The various imperialist nations of the late World War were not eager to seize land or colonies

per se from one another, but rather the vital natural resources. The French, for example, wanted and finally secured the Saar coal basin, and the iron industrial basin of Alsace-Lorraine with its iron mines and steel goods factories. The Germans aimed, on the other hand, at the expropriation of the Belgian and French iron basins, the coal and iron basins of Poland, etc.

Monopoly Capitalism did not and could not establish peace on earth. Although the monopolists divided up the world among themselves, disagreements were not eliminated. They still intrigued and competed for one another's natural resources, for one another's colonies and spheres of influence. Besides, the thwarting of the desire for expansion on the part of those nations, like Italy and Japan, that came late on the imperialistic scene is certain to precipitate a World War sooner or later.

World Wars particularly characterize the last stage of Capitalism (Imperialism). These conflicts, directed by finance capital, develop a proletariat more and more conscious of its historic task. Then the Capitalists will realize that the spectre of Communism is no more a spectre. It is incarnated in the flesh and blood of the Proletarian Revolution and marches, as in Soviet

Russia, to eventual victory over the now reactionary Bourgeoisie. Once, when in conflict with the absolute monarchs, the bourgeois were revolutionists. Then they spoke of the right to revolt. For they wished to organize a powerful nation to support them in their effort to develop industry, which to them meant the accumulation of large private fortunes. But as soon as they were secure in the capitalist saddle, Revolution was anathematized by them. If a revolutionist killed one bourgeois they spoke of the RED TERROR; if they killed and wounded tens of millions of people, as in the late war, it was merely an unfortunate incident of a war for Democracy.* This subterfuge, however, will ultimately prove useless, for the Proletariat, regardless of its ignorance, desires Work and Bread and Peace. But the Imperialists of the world are unable to supply them with these essential necessities of life. So that those, and General Foch is the latest of them, who speak

*One of these bourgeois luminaries says of the Commune in the Revolution of 1789: "There is such a phenomenon as a collective lust for blood, and, sociologically speaking, we have a right to class together the behavior of the Commune in the Revolution of 1789, and of the Aztecs in their systematized orgies of human sacrifice."

of the next World War, which is sure to eventuate in the near future, will discover that the class-conscious proletariat will once and forever put a period to Imperialist War by means of Proletarian Revolution.

Proletarian Revolution is the child of monopoly capitalism and the world wars it precipitates. It has for its purpose the capture of political power in order to be in a position to socialize the highly centralised industries of Capitalism, which produce communistically but are owned privately. This transformation of privately-owned industry into socialized industry, of production for profit into production for use, of private property into communal property, is the economic basis for the elimination of War. When the Dictatorship of the Proletariat has finally completed this task and has destroyed the bourgeoisie as a class, it will vanish from the historic scene. With it disappear Revolutionary, as opposed to Imperialist, Wars. Since society is now classless, and the interests of the individual are in harmony with those of society, friction is reduced almost to zero. The consequent spread of Socialism and its harmonic economy, that of Co-operation, over the earth ushers in the reign of conscious peace.

And when the slogan, To each according to his needs and from each according to his ability, has been actually realized in the final phase of Communism, and the last vestiges of bourgeois law and ideology have been eradicated from the consciousness of humanity, then will it be evident to all and sundry, as it is now to the few, that "human nature" is flexible, that it is peaceful, as in Savagery and Barbarism, and warlike, as in Civilisation and in the period of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and peaceful again, as in the two phases of Communism, depending upon the nature of the economy of the particular phase of social evolution in question.*

*Since private property in the means of production evolves from zero in Savagery to monopoly in the last stage of Capitalism (Imperialism), and, correspondingly, since war and revolution follow the same course of evolution, i. e., they are zero in Savagery and world-wide in the period of Imperialism; and further, since the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is the prolegomenon to the epochs of social peace, which the two phases of Communism elaborate and realize, a concise picture of society in its various phases of development will prove useful at this point.

MARXIAN SCHEME OF SOCIAL EVOLUTION.

- (1) Savagery—Lower, Middle, Upper.
- (2) Barbarism—Lower, Middle, Upper.
- (3) Civilisation—Slave, Feudal, Capitalist.
- (4) Communism—
 - (a) Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

112 THE EVOLUTION OF WAR

(b) Socialism, the first phase of Communism.

(c) The highest phase of Communism.

I classify the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, the period of transition from Capitalism, the last phase of Civilisation, to Socialism, the first phase of Communism, under the general caption COMMUNISM, because it introduces the latter historical category and also for the sake of symmetry.

It is evident on the face of it that this classification is not complete, for it deals only with the evolution of society in its ascending phase. But science, as is well known, "predicts for the earth a possible end and for its inhabitability a fairly certain one, which, therefore, also recognizes that in human history there is not only an upshooting, but also a down-going branch" (Engels, Feuerbach, p. 43). So that from this study of war one must not conclude that we have arrived at eternal peace forever and ever when Communism has been established. It teaches rather that the dialectic method is one that deals with relative social forms and conditions; it shuns the absolutes of civilised metaphysics. No Marxist in his senses should speak of eternal peace. What he can predicate is that since humanity will not perish from the earth within the next few million years, the evolution of society will follow the course outlined in this footnote, and war will be eliminated in accordance with the Marxian prediction. But nowhere does the Marxist say that peace will reign on earth forever. Marxian Dialectics and Historical Materialism only show how society evolves from phase to phase, depending on the underlying material conditions. If in the far distant future, that is when nature and society are degenerating, the material conditions are altered to the detriment of humanity, one may expect conflict on the earth again as a prelude to social extinction. In sooth, we Marxists are rigorous realists: we do not promise a peaceful and happy existence to Humanity for aye and aye.

CONCLUSION.

War, like everything else in the Universe, has had a beginning. And in searching for its origin one discovers that it is non-existent among plants, animals, and savages. It was found that the latter are, contrary to the benighted belief of bourgeois scholarship, the most peaceful of men.

If the savage ever fights, and he seldom does, we find him engaged in personal combat, generally with the intention of rendering his antagonist *hors du combat* rather than slaying him. Further: the weapons of the earlier phases of Savagery are so primitive that warfare could hardly be carried on with them. And even in the later phase, when the bow-and-arrow was introduced, conflict did not increase to any marked extent. The new weapon merely enabled the savage to engage in hunting as a normal occupation. Prior thereto fruits, nuts, roots, and with the introduction of fire, fish (including crabs, mollusks,

and other aquatic animals) were the principal elements of his subsistence. With the invention of the club and spear, first fabricated of wood and later of stone, venison was occasionally added to the savage bill of fare. The bow-and-arrow, instead of introducing war in the savage world, merely made venison the chief element of his diet. He hunted the wild beast more successfully with this instrument of the chase, and also his personal enemy. A single case cannot be cited of a savage tribe in the bow-and-arrow stage engaging in warfare. That is to say, we cannot discover that one savage tribe actually took the field against another savage tribe. If, as in Australia and elsewhere, revenge is sought for a real or fancied injury, only the immediate kinsmen of the injured tribesman engage in the feud. Moreover, they never kill indiscriminately, but only according to the tribal rules relating to blood-vengeance; and as soon as vengeance has been wreaked the feud is terminated. Spencer and Gillen tell us of these savages that border relations are generally amicable, and that there is no constant state of enmity between them (*Native Tribes of Australia*, p. 32). Although these savages do not

possess the bow-and-arrow the same state of peacefulness prevails among those that do. For the more developed exogamic laws of the Gano-wanian tribe would effectively paralyze their warlike activities despite the possession of a superior weapon. Exogamy also explains the strange fact that savages seldom molest women when engaged in combat. "This is the more intelligible," says L. T. Hobhouse (*Morals in Evolution*, vol. I., p. 251), "when the fighting tribes are exogamous, so that the wife of a warrior on one side is sister or daughter of a champion on the other." The savages, usually naked and houseless, return to their normal occupations of the chase and the hunt after vengeance has been wreaked. They continue to live, as the Golden Age myths relate, peaceful and happy lives. For how can people like those of Baffin's Land or of Micronesia, for example, be unhappy if the former, according to Reclus, had no warfare and could not even be made to understand the meaning of "battles," and the latter, when they occasionally fought, ended the so-called war on the death of two or three warriors by the exchange of presents? The savage, it should be realised, is by no means a murderous

brute, as the perverted Civilizees believe, but merely a peaceful child of nature, a naive for-ester, a simple man of the woods and the plains.

The source of this condition of savage peace is, as the Golden Age myths tell us and as Anthropology proves, the existence of Communism in property. In the savage world the means of production are owned in common. The hunting and fishing grounds are no one's private property, so that all and sundry are free to appropriate the fruits of nature without let or hindrance. Society, communistically organized, is intolerant to class division. The State, contrary to the opinion of Herbert Spencer, R. Holsti, Prof. Lenz, and especially Profs. Meyer and Brinton, who speak respectively of dog-states and bee-, ant-, and beaver-states, is not to be found in their society. The soldier, the judge, and the priest are nowhere visible on the savage horizon. Mars, the god of war, and Eris, the goddess of Discord or Revolution, were not fashioned by the mind of the savage. The passion for war, based on that for private property, is alien to savage human nature.

Peace, interrupted by petty feuds in which little, if any, life is lost, continues to reign on the earth until matriarchalism is supplanted by

patriarchalism. In the Eastern Hemisphere the monopolisation of the flocks and herds of the tribe by the patriarchs results, here and there, in Amazonian uprisings. The women are defeated by the men usually with little blood-letting. Then the patriarchs engage in cattle raids in order to accumulate this new means of production as private property. In the Western Hemisphere the tribes that have become patriarchal, the Aztecs for example, send out expeditions to exact tribute from the neighboring tribes and to capture sacrificial victims for their gods. "The Mexicans," says Hobhouse (op. cit., vol. I., p. 249), "maintained an eternal warfare with the Tlaxcala in order that the supply of captives for the sacrifice be kept." These raids, whether for cattle or for tribute, etc., are not to be classed as wars, for the casualties on the field of combat are insignificant. Even in the late period of Barbarism, as among the Greeks of Homeric society, there are only combats between chief and chief. The Trojan War, although lasting a decade, is comparatively bloodless; and, at the most, may be considered as a transition from the raids of patriarchal barbarism to the actual wars of Civilisation. Hobhouse testifies to the correctness of this view in

these words: "In Homeric Greece wars were often little more than raids for women and cattle lifting, or they were reprisals for similar raids by a hostile clan." As to the peacefulness of the other barbarians on the verge of Civilisation, Krauss says that the 'Urgermane' became a warrior but gradually. The Germans were so prone to peace that they fled precipitately before the nomadic Huns, and, arriving at the border of the Roman Empire, they begged the Romans for a home therein. Only when the latter began to oppress and enslave them did they become warlike. In a word, contact with Civilisation taught them the art of war.

The basis for the relative peacefulness of Barbarism is found in the fact that private property in the means of production, as well as the division of society into warring classes, is nowhere fully developed. In the Middle Period of Barbarism the germ of private property was sown, but even the later period could not develop this germ to the point where the exploitation of man by man, of one economic class by another, was possible. For that the State and Private Property in Land, which is the chief means of production, were necessary.

The State and the private ownership of land

usher in Civilisation, the Society of War par excellence. In its first phase, that of slavery, war is carried on by means of special armies chiefly for the purpose of securing slaves to work the privately-owned land. The lust for slaves and tribute precipitates wars between slave-empire and slave-empire, which result in their mutual ruin. The accumulation of property in the hands of the rich divides society into classes ever at war with each other. Civil wars break out—patrician against plebeian, and slave against freeman. War and Revolution, which characterize slave Civilisation, are also peculiar to the second phase of Civilisation, namely Feudalism. Feudal lord fights feudal lord. The constant wars they engage in are for the purpose of accumulating property. The “big” baron finally swallows up the “little” baron and his property. And then the former encroaches on the communal property rights of his serfs and tenants, who are thus driven to revolt. The peasant revolutions are suppressed, as all historically reactionary movements are and will be. The absolute monarchs, in the saddle for a time, are eventually unseated by the rising bourgeoisie who are as restive under feudal as under post-feudal restrictions. National wars, for the crea-

tion of the proper bourgeois political form, are engaged in and completed by the year 1871. Capitalism, with its mania for profits, is now firmly established as a system. Its further expansion expresses itself in the policy of Colonialism. The "colonial fever" seizes the Capitalists. They enter into the Imperialistic phase of their evolution and occupy the lands of the savages and barbarians of Asia, Africa, and other continents, in order to unload upon the uncivilised natives the surplus commodities of capitalist industry and, above all, to find scope for the investment of their surplus capital. This capital, chiefly in the form of steel rails, munitions, machinery, etc., are in the main means of production, and not articles of consumption. Industry has now shifted from the production of commodities as a focus to that of means of production, that is to say the cotton industry has been subordinated to the metallurgical industry. This shift, as Pavlovitch has shown, is the prelude to Imperialism and Monopoly Capitalism. The free competition of pre-monopolistic capitalism, which was little interested in colonies, is now an anachronism. Monopoly Capitalism, under the aegis of finance capital, expresses itself in imperialistic, as contrasted with national, wars; for

colonies are now necessary, as Cecil Rhodes said, to serve as a vent for overproduction and overpopulation, and thereby to guard Capitalist society against Civil War. At the same time the concentration of capital and the centralization of industry by the imperialistic monopolists assist in the organization of a more and more class-conscious proletariat. The latter insistently demand Peace and Bread. But the Capitalists find it increasingly difficult to supply them with these desiderata, for Monopoly, as Lenin has shown, curtails production and raises the prices of the necessities of life and, what is of most significance, engenders world wars. The war of 1914-1918 is a case in point. It was fought for the purpose of expropriating the Central Powers of their coal and iron mines, their colonies, and foreign markets. As a consequence of this war, which shook the very foundation of Capitalism, the workers of Russia were enabled to establish the first workers or Soviet state, in which the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is not only engaged in suppressing the Bourgeoisie, but in building a society free from private property and exploitation.

Civilisation as a whole is then the society of war because it is the society of private property.

It is the society of revolution because private property divides it into classes, the freeman and the slave, the feudal lord and the serf, the capitalist and the proletarian. The gradual accumulation of private property throughout the civilised epochs intensifies the wars and revolutions until, in the phase of Monopoly Capitalism, they become almost unbearable. Man then learns that only by suppressing the bourgeoisie and by transforming private into communal property, can Humanity rid itself of the scourge of war. The period of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, in which revolutionary wars for the final destruction of Capitalism will be waged, presages the peace and happiness of the period that is to follow, namely Socialism or the first phase of Communism. Then private property and classes having been eliminated, Pax, the goddess of Peace, reigns o'er the earth. The war-god Mars and the other chief gods of Civilisation, as Vulcan, the god of Hard Work, and Mammon, the god of Money, are dethroned. The hours of labor are reduced to a minimum by the "magic" of social production. Man now controls the product of his labor: the fetichism of commodities is a dead religion. Humanity, purged of exploitation, is in a position to educate itself and finally to free

itself from the tyranny of ignorance and superstition. Then, and then only, will man and woman enter the final phase of Communism, in which one contributes to society according to one's ability and receives according to one's needs. And in such a society War and Revolution will have become a social anachronism—of interest only to the student of social evolution. In a word, just as Civilisation is the Society of War and Misery par excellence so Communism is the Society of Peace and Happiness.

FINIS.

 T5-CWT-706

